

CHILDREN OF LIGHT



THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK - BOSTON - CHICAGO - DALLAS
ATLANTA - SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO, LIMITED
LONDON - BOMBAY - CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
OF CANADA, LIMITED
TORONTO

1970.1.1.10.1



RUFUS M JONES

Hollander & Feldman

CHILDREN OF LIGHT

In Honor of Rufus M. Jones

EDITED BY HOWARD H. BRINTON

NEW YORK
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1938

**-COPYRIGHT, 1938,
By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY**

All rights reserved—no part of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper.

Set up and printed Published January, 1938

First Printing.

FOR RUFUS M. JONES ON HIS SEVENTY-FIFTH
BIRTHDAY

For all that thou hast given to thy friends
Of wisdom and delight, in word and book,
Rufus, our hearts give thanks; nor can we look

Rightly for that rich gift to make amends:
Untold remain man's greatest debts to man
For there are heights and depths no thought can plumb:
Upon the mount of God the mind is dumb,
Silence alone may say what no word can.

Man in the inward stillness learns to pray,

Joining in fellowship with those above
On whom doth shine the light of heavenly day.
No word we know can speak the thought of love,
Ever that best word must unspoken be:
So mutely, gratefully, we think of thee.

T. EDMUND HARVEY

CONTENTS

*(Chapters approximately in chronological order of subjects
with similar subjects grouped together)*

	PAGE
Sonnet to Rufus M. Jones. <i>T. Edmund Harvey</i>	v
Introduction. <i>Howard H. Brinton</i>	ix
I. William Penn's <i>Christian Quaker</i> . <i>Herbert G. Wood</i>	1
II. William Penn, Constitution Maker. <i>Francis R. Taylor</i>	25
III. Personality Types of Two Quaker Leaders. <i>Catharine Cox Miles</i>	55
IV. The Problem of Edward Byllynge. PART I. HIS CONNECTION WITH CORNWALL. <i>L. Violet Holdsworth</i>	85
V. The Problem of Edward Byllynge. PART II. HIS WRITINGS AND THEIR EVIDENCE OF HIS INFLUENCE ON THE FIRST CONSTITUTION OF NEW JERSEY. <i>John L. Nickalls</i>	109
VI. Hebraica and the Jews in Early Quaker Inter- est. <i>Henry Joel Cadbury</i>	133
VII. Latin Works of Friends. <i>Anna Cox Brinton</i>	165
VIII. The Mennonites and the Quakers of Holland. <i>William I. Hull</i>	189
IX. Joseph Hewes, the Quaker Signer. <i>Charles Francis Jenkins</i>	211
X. New England Quakers and Military Service in the American Revolution. <i>Arthur J. Mekeel</i>	241

	PAGE
XI. Quakerism and Home Life: An Eighteenth Century Study. <i>Isabel Grubb</i>	277
XII. The Quaker Contribution to the Old Northwest. <i>Harlow Lindley</i>	305
XIII. Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, Bart. (1786–1845) : A Footnote to <i>Elizabeth Fry: Quaker Heroine</i> . <i>Janet Payne Whitney</i>	331
XIV. Timothy Nicholson, Candle of the Lord. <i>Walter C. Woodward</i>	355
XV. Stages in Spiritual Development as Exemplified in Quaker Journals. <i>Howard H. Brinton</i>	381
List of Works of Rufus M. Jones	407
Index	413

INTRODUCTION

The essays in this book have been written by students of Quaker history in honor of Rufus M. Jones. They are presented on his seventy-fifth birthday as an affectionate tribute of gratitude and admiration to one who has contributed more widely than any person now living to knowledge and understanding of the history of the Society of Friends. A sheaf of philosophical essays might have been prepared in recognition of Rufus Jones as a philosopher. Expositions of religious thought might have honored him as a religious thinker. Discussions of Quaker efforts at solving social problems might have been appropriate because Rufus Jones has for so many years served as chairman of the American Friends Service Committee. We who write this book are able to commemorate only one aspect of Rufus Jones's many-sided life and scholarship. Our essays are strictly historical. But in honoring Rufus Jones as historian we look up to him as more than an historian. His writings in Quaker history glow with a meaning which is of cosmic and ultimate significance. The history of a small nation was used by the writers of the Old Testament to set forth the ways of God with man. We feel that Rufus Jones has, in a measure, used the history of a small Christian sect to define, in terms of today, the nature of divine-human relationship. In his hands history has become, not a rehearsal of occurrences, but a drama of souls seeking and finding fulfilment in God.

Rufus Jones's most important contribution to the his-

tory of the Society of Friends has consisted in his demonstration that Quakerism was not an isolated phenomenon, not a kind of "sport" in church history, but a movement which took shape and persisted as an integral part of the great current of mystical religion flowing out of a remote past. Until recently Quakers have, for the most part, been singularly unaware of their spiritual ancestry in England and on the continent of Europe. The long reaches of religious history from early Christianity to George Fox appeared to them as a "dark night of apostasy." It remained for Rufus Jones to show that Quakerism is one of the fundamental manifestations of a spirit in Christianity which has never been without some witness.

As a student under Rufus Jones at Haverford College, I was thrilled in watching the development of these ideas in his mind. Here I witnessed the publication of *A Dynamic Faith* (1901), *A Boy's Religion from Memory* (1902), *George Fox, an Autobiography* (1903), *Social Law in the Spiritual World* (1904), and *The Double Search* (1905). In these books Rufus Jones first fully developed his own method of dealing with religious and philosophical problems. We who were privileged to attend his graduate seminar can testify that the same period found him well started in historical study on the subject of mysticism.

Rufus M. Jones and John Wilhelm Rowntree of England planned in 1901 a joint interpretation of mysticism and Quakerism. The untimely death of John Wilhelm Rowntree in 1905 changed this plan, but Rufus Jones, ably helped by other collaborators, went on with the task, and the result was the Rowntree Series in seven volumes, published by Macmillan. Rufus Jones was responsible for the first two volumes, *Studies in Mystical Religion*

and *Spiritual Reformers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. These books threw a flood of new light on the spiritual antecedents of the Quakers. William Charles Braithwaite's scholarly volumes on *The Beginnings of Quakerism* and *The Second Period of Quakerism* came next. They in turn have been succeeded by two comprehensive works by Rufus Jones, *The Quakers in the American Colonies* (in which he was assisted by Isaac Sharpless and Amelia Mott Gummere) and *The Later Periods of Quakerism* (2 vols.). Introductions, initiating each successive volume of the series, unite them all into a correlated whole. These prefatory essays were all written by Rufus Jones. Although he was to write other historical works, his powers as an historian and as an interpreter of history reached full development in this remarkable series which occupies a unique and significant place in the history of the Christian Church.

The essays in this book, although they cover a wide range of subjects, are not without inherent unity of a nature suggested by the title of the collection. "Children of the Light" was an early name for the Quakers and these studies illustrate various ways and means by which the "Inner Light" was followed by its children. The order is approximately chronological, with similar subjects grouped together. The first five essays deal with the founders of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, the next three with Quaker dealings with the continent of Europe as carried on in Hebrew, Latin and Dutch. Quakers during the American Revolution are represented by two essays. The next four deal with various aspects of life in the Society of Friends in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the final essay presents general considerations which have a bearing upon the whole history of Quakerism.

We wish to express our gratitude to the Macmillan

Company, publishers of so many of Rufus M. Jones's books, for their help in producing this tribute to their and our friend.

HOWARD H. BRINTON

Pendle Hill
Wallingford, Pa.
November, 1937

William Penn's *The Christian Quaker*
Herbert G. Wood

I

WILLIAM PENN'S *THE CHRISTIAN QUAKER*

The Christian Quaker, together with the supplementary discourse on the rule of faith and practice, is William Penn's most important contribution in the field of theology. *The Sandy Foundation Shaken*, with its challenge to the traditional doctrine of the Trinity and the vulgar notions of a penal satisfaction in Christ's death and of imputed righteousness, is a more original and more vigorous writing. As a positive interpretation of Quaker life and thought, *No Cross, No Crown* is a finer work of more enduring interest and appeal. But the importance of *The Christian Quaker* lies in the fact that here Penn deals fully with the great problems of Quaker theology, namely, the relation of the universal saving light in which Friends believe, to (a) the religious experience of mankind, (b) the historic Christ, and (c) the seat of authority in religion. William Penn's discussion of these themes may be inadequate and outmoded; the themes themselves continue to be of absorbing interest and no sincere handling of them can fail to be instructive.

The occasion which led Penn and Whitehead to compose the treatise on *The Christian Quaker* was the publication of *A Dialogue between a Quaker and a Christian* by a Baptist named Thomas Hicks. The *Dialogue* not only misrepresented the convictions of Quakers but also assumed that Quakers were not Christians. It is strange to reflect that some modern Quakers might not be of-

fended by this assumption. Today some are drawn to Quakerism because they regard Quakerism as something bigger than Christianity, and because, in becoming Quakers, they are not asked to commit themselves to any definite Christian doctrines. But early Friends were indignant at the suggestion that they were anything but Christian. To them Quakerism was essentially a form of Christianity, indeed the truest, purest form of Christianity.

The Christian Quaker was issued in two parts, the first, more general, written by William Penn, and the second, more particular, being a detailed answer to the statements and allegations of Thomas Hicks, and for this George Whitehead was responsible. In its present form, as it is reprinted in Volume I of Penn's *Select Works*, the first, more general part has lost the original controversial reference. Its leading topics are handled in a more serene atmosphere. John William Graham must have had the reprint in the *Select Works* in mind, when he concluded his account of *The Christian Quaker* by saying that "neither disputant had yet referred personally to the other."¹ The original first edition shows that William Penn as well as George Whitehead made constant reference to T. Hicks and other critics of Quakerism, and passed direct censures upon them. The main differences between the first edition and the revised version in the *Select Works* should be noted here.

The date of the treatise is given in the *Select Works* as 1669, and this is manifestly wrong. The discussion which precipitated the book did not take place till 1673, and *The Christian Quaker* is catalogued by Joseph Smith under the year 1674. The *Epistle to the Noble Bereans of this Age* which now stands as the Preface to the treatise,

¹ J. W. Graham, *Life of William Penn*, p. 86.

was originally signed by "your greatly traduced but truly Christian Friends, William Penn, George Whitehead," and was dated "16, X., 74." It has been re-edited and made singular, as from Penn only, in order to fit it to the issue of Part I as a separate publication. The first edition contained a historical preface, a rapid survey of persecution and intolerance, which is now omitted. It deserves to be reprinted. Among other things it includes a Presbyterian testimony to the part played by Quakers during the persecution under the Clarendon Code. "As one of themselves said, We [Quakers] were the bulwarks that received the shot." It includes also a firm rejection of the orthodox assertion, "*Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*," which is interpreted fairly but tersely in the phrase, "out of a church, out of the faith: not Dipt, not Christian'd." Again, the first edition had three introductory chapters setting forth the occasion of the discourse and the unhandsome dealing of T. Hicks. These are omitted and the opening of Chapter IV is recast, so as to become Chapter I of the version in the *Select Works*. Throughout the text, the personal allusions are omitted from the revised edition. In the first edition, T. Hicks, H. J. Faldo, J. Bunion (? Bunyan), J. Grig and others appear like the refrain in Widdicombe Fair. Where the more sober later version speaks of "our enemies," the first edition referred to "H. H. J. Faldo, Tho. Hicks, and a multitude of other Barkers at it" (the Inner Light), or to "J. Faldo, J. Bunion, J. Grig and that malicious T. Hicks with the rest of their Fraternity in Notion." The whole treatise gains in dignity and accuracy by William Penn's careful revision of it. He rightly judged that the controversial setting was only of temporary interest, and it was a wise proceeding to separate Part I from Part II, which was purely controversial and rather involved. At the

same time, there are some illuminating as well as virile touches in the first edition. Thus it throws light both on Penn's limitations as a critic of the drama and on his chivalry in defence of the reputation of Puritan opponents to find in Chapter III of the first edition an allusion to the "Infamous Playes of those comical wits, Sylvester, Shackspeer, Johnson etc. with too many of our own days, wherein the Preciseness and singularity of Puritans and others are abusively represented and exposed to the life for the entertainment of vain and Irreligious Persons"!

It may be convenient to approach the more detailed examination of the main arguments of the book by inquiring how far *The Christian Quaker* reflects the influence of the two years spent by Penn at Saumur. Was Penn's theology shaped to any appreciable extent by the teachings of Moses Amyraut, the distinguished head of the Protestant College in Saumur? According to William I. Hull, "Penn's biographers have differed as to the influence on him of this course in Calvinism, the Quaker writers suggesting that it helped him to react strongly, as did the rest of his fellow-Quakers, against the whole Calvinistic system, but the non-Quakers believing that such a modified system of Calvinism acted as a bridge over into a saner theology than that of Fox and Barclay." C. E. Vulliamy assumes that Penn must have been deeply impressed by the teaching and personality of Amyraut, and Miss Brailsford traces the probable influence of Amyraut in many directions on Penn's style and thought.

It is, however, not quite certain that Penn heard Amyraut lecture. In 1657 this much-respected teacher was crippled by a severe accident, and on the title-page of the English translation of his *Traité des Religions*, which was published as early as 1660, he is described as "Late Professor of Divinity at Saumur in France." This

suggests that he had given up lecturing by the time Penn entered the College in 1662. Nevertheless the most recent dictionary of French biography assumes that Amyraut continued to act as principal and professor at the college until his death in January, 1664, and Miss Brailsford thinks he must have recovered sufficiently from his accident to resume teaching when Penn was among the students. In any case the Amyraut tradition drew Penn to Saumur, and he must have become acquainted with the main features of Amyraldism, through the writings of the master and through his colleagues and successors, even if he did not sit at the feet of Amyraut himself. The incidental reference to Amiraldus towards the beginning of the discourse on the rule of faith implies that Penn knew something of the treatise concerning Religions, but does not indicate any deep personal impression of its author.²

It is generally agreed that Penn must have laid the foundations of his knowledge of the classics and the Fathers at Saumur, and obviously he was a man of wide reading. His close acquaintance with the Scriptures and his well-informed use of the best commentators of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries also resulted from his education under Amyraut. It is thought that his lavish use of quotations from ancient authors, both in the

² The passage in Penn's *Select Works*, 3rd edition, vol. 1, p. 295, runs as follows:

"That men, in all ages, have had a belief of God and some knowledge of him, though not upon equal discovery, must be granted from that account that all story gives of mankind in matters of religion. Several have fully performed this: of old, Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Augustine and others: of latter times, Du Plessy, Grotius, Amiraldus, L. Herbert and above all Dr. Cudworth: and indeed the relicks we have of the most ancient historians and authors are a demonstration in this point."

The appreciative reference to Dr. Cudworth is absent from the first edition. Presumably Penn has in mind Cudworth's *True Intellectual System of the Universe*. As this book was first published in 1678, the revised version of the *Christian Quaker* now found in the *Select Works* must be subsequent to that date.

second part of *No Cross, No Crown* and in *The Christian Quaker*, reflects Amyraut's passion for quotation and it is even suggested that Penn may have adopted this style of composition in his early writings in compliment to his French master.³ In the case of *No Cross, No Crown* the literary citations are something of a superfluity, an example of the "cheerful pedantry" which Vulliamy ascribes to Amyraut. But in *The Christian Quaker* the evidence produced for the existence and lofty character of "Gentile Divinity" is essential to Penn's argument. His scholarship is more simply directed to his main purpose.

Chapters VII to XIII of *The Christian Quaker* afford ample material for estimating the character of Penn's scholarship. J. W. Graham observes that "many of his references are given from the originals, many also he quotes from the writings of Clement of Alexandria. He draws through Clement on the Sibylline books and through Iamblichus on Pythagoras."⁴ His references to original authorities give a somewhat exaggerated impression of his independence as a scholar. On page 219 he quotes the epitaph on Anaxagoras as "englished by T. Stanley" and on page 225 he refers to "Stoical maxims collected by T. S. for us."⁵ He was clearly acquainted with the history of philosophy by Thomas Stanley which was published in 1658, and a comparison with Stanley's work reveals the fact that the bulk of Penn's quotations from the early Greek philosophers, from Socrates and the Stoics, are lifted verbally from Stanley's pages. At the same time, Penn is not slavishly dependent on Stanley. In one particular, Stanley's work is curiously defective.

³ M. R. Brailsford, *The Making of William Penn*, p. 123, and William I. Hull, *William Penn: a Topical Biography*, p. 82.

⁴ Graham, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

⁵ William Penn, *Select Works*, 3rd edition. He had apparently used Stanley's catenae in *No Cross, No Crown*, part II.

Stanley follows Diogenes Laertius very closely, and for some reason or other, Laertius in his *Lives of the Greek Philosophers* does not deal with Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans until his ninth book. Chronologically this is most misleading, as Pythagoras should certainly be handled before Plato and Aristotle. Stanley appears to have got tired when he reached Book VIII of Diogenes Laertius, for he gives no account whatever of Pythagoras. Penn is alive to the seriousness of this omission. As Graham notes, he draws on Iamblichus for sayings of Pythagoras, and he interweaves these sayings at points which are logically and chronologically appropriate. Even where he is following Stanley's text most closely, Penn seems to have verified his references—a great part of true scholarship!—and to have cited additional authorities. Particularly this seems to be true of his references to Latin writers such as Seneca and Lactantius. He also supplemented Stanley by his own independent reading of Clement of Alexandria, particularly of Book I of the *Stromata*.⁶ He drew on Clement not only for passages from the Sibylline books, but also for quotations from the Greek poets, epic and dramatic, and for some of his citations from Greek philosophers. It is noteworthy that Penn discarded Clement's mistaken theory that Greek wisdom was borrowed from barbarian sources and ultimately from Moses and the prophets. Moreover, his selection of scripture parallels to the precepts of Gentile Divinity is quite independent of Clement's similar commentary. I have not so far found one instance of Penn and Clement adducing the same passage of Scripture in illustration of the same teaching from a Greek philosopher. His training at Saumur and his Quaker faith combined to enable Penn to make a

⁶ See especially the footnote to pp. 298, 299 of Vol. I, *Select Works*, 3rd edition.

discreet and independent use both of original authorities and of the work of contemporary scholars.

If Saumur developed Penn's interest in the classics and in patristics and helped him to marshal the materials of his argument, did it also contribute to form the convictions expressed in his account of Gentile Divinity? He is claiming that some measure of the light of Christ, a truly saving light, had been vouchsafed to the Gentiles before Christ's coming. The presence of this light is evidenced by their arriving at certain fundamental truths of religion and morality. The Gentiles were led to believe in one holy, infinite and eternal God. They believed further that God hath imprinted the knowledge of himself on the minds of all men, and in this belief the Gentiles had the support and endorsement of the fathers of the Ancient Catholic Church. In the third place, the Gentile thinkers held and practiced high sanctity of life; they were men of virtuous lives and taught the indispensableness thereof to life eternal. Finally they believed in a life to come, and in future rewards and punishments, and here Penn notes that in respect of faith in immortality some Greeks had a clearer enlightenment than the Jews themselves. As a further argument for the sufficiency of the light given to the Gentiles, Penn observes that some of them "saw a state above swearing," and he also interprets Virgil's Fourth Eclogue as evidence that the heathen had a sight of the coming of Christ.

From this picture of Gentile Divinity it is clear that Penn had escaped from the barriers which seventeenth century divines had reared against the possibility of the salvation of the heathen, barriers which still held captive Sir Thomas Browne when he wrote in *Religio Medici*, "There is no salvation to those that believe not in Christ, that is, say some, since his Nativity, and as Divinity af-

firmeth, before also: which makes me much apprehend the ends of those honest Worthies and Philosophers which dyed before his Incarnation.”⁷ Penn was free from these apprehensions and it is probable that Amyraut’s more modified Calvinism helped to liberate him. For according to T. M. Lindsay,⁸ Amyraut, following Zwingli, taught that God in providence did bestow upon pious heathen what in their case did amount to an external call, such as seventeenth century divines accounted necessary for salvation. According to the same authority, Amyraut also “widened the precisely fixed sphere of conversion by insisting that every illumination of the intellect was an analogue and prophecy of the spiritual enlightenment which produces conversion.” Sir Thomas Browne failed to perceive this analogue or prophecy of spiritual enlightenment in heathen piety when he wrote, “men that live according to the right rule and law of reason live but in their own kind, as beasts do in theirs.”⁹ But for Penn, it became the intellectual framework of his doctrine of a universal saving light, though he read a good deal more into it than his teacher would probably have accepted.

If Amyraut would not have gone all the way with Penn in his estimate of Gentile Divinity, it seems that he set him on the right road. Miss Brailsford tells us that in his great treatise on Christian morality, Amyraut sought to portray a natural morality—that is, a morality founded upon the human conscience. Man should endeavor “to build upon the foundations laid by nature, the instruction given to him by revelation: and to that end, while not neglecting the light which may reach him from without, it is the human conscience, his own conscience above all, which he must study and interrogate. *The Laws of*

⁷ Thos. Browne, *Religio Medici*, part I, section 54.

⁸ *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, article *Amyraldism*, I, 405.

⁹ Browne, *Religio Medici*: loc. cit.

God are everywhere printed upon the heart of man, who is himself their true commentary.”¹⁰ This teaching certainly has affinities with the Quaker conception of the Light Within. In his *Treatise concerning Religions*, Amyraut argues against Epicureans that God has made some revelation of Himself to all men, but he maintains against incipient Deists that this wider revelation only comes to clearness and assurance through the special revelation in Christ. Amyraut will tolerate no suggestion that all religions stand on the same level and mean essentially the same thing. He believes more strongly in natural morality than he does in natural religion and he observes shrewdly that “Cicero is much more certain and positive in the description of our mutual obligations in his books *De Officiis* than he is in his doctrine of the Nature of the Gods.” He suggests, rather quaintly, that God may have been more concerned to preserve among the heathen the rudiments of social morality than to keep alive the knowledge of Himself. “God, having purposed that the world should subsist till a certain time . . . has presided in an especial manner over the minds of Legislators and Philosophers to guide them to teach things suitable for the conservation of humane society, and over the minds of the people in general to cause them to comprehend and conform to the same.”¹¹ At the same time, Amyraut is very emphatic on the limitations and defects even of Gentile morality, let alone Gentile Divinity. The Pagans lacked true patience and humility,¹² and failed to observe the respect due to kings and magistrates. Probably with the assassination of Henry IV in his mind, Amyraut roundly condemns the assassins of Julius Caesar.

¹⁰ Brailsford, *op cit.*, p. 122

¹¹ Amyraldus. *On Religion*, p. 265.

¹² With this analysis it would be interesting to compare John Foster's essay on the aversion of men of taste from evangelical religion.

"It is certain that it was an evil and culpable attempt, with which their memories will for ever be stained." William Penn's respect for royal authority in the person of James II may have been strengthened by contact with Moses Amyraut!

William Penn's estimate of the extent and spiritual value of Gentile enlightenment is more generous and less cautious than Amyraut's. He writes in the spirit of Justin Martyr, of whom Rendel Harris said, "When he saw Socrates struggling in the sea, he was not content merely to throw him a rope to assist his salvation, but he hauled him on board the ship of Christian faith and bade him make himself at home with the crew." Like Justin Martyr, William Penn recognizes Christians before Christ. He was the more enthusiastic in his praise of Gentile Divinity, because in some particulars Greek philosophers supported Quaker testimonies. Socrates' refusal to take fees for teaching and his condemnation of the Sophists for money-making were in line with Friends' distrust of a paid ministry, and Penn was glad to find pre-Christian sages who condemned swearing and maintained Friends' testimony against oaths. Penn pointed the contrast on these differences between Gentile Divinity and the practice of professing Christians so sharply that he lent some color to Keith's charge that he recognized only pagans as fellow-Christians, and disowned all who profess and call themselves Christians other than Friends!

Penn's onslaught on the narrowness of seventeenth century Calvinistic theology is vigorous and splendid. It outrages him that Calvinistical predestinarians should suppose God capable of condemning men to eternal misery while withholding from them the light needed for salvation. "I confess," he writes, "I should despair of entering some of our adversaries, whose souls are pinched up within

the narrow compass of a most unmerciful kind of predestination, making the eternal God as partial as themselves; like some ancients, that because they could not resemble God, they would make such gods as might resemble them.”¹³ The story of Cornelius in Acts X seems to warrant a better hope of the salvation of Gentiles. “But last of all that which greatly joyes is this, that the narrowness of some men’s spirits in this world, will not be found able to exclude virtuous Gentiles from their reward in the other: but maugre all the heat, petulancy, conceitedness and fleshly boasting of carnal Christians, ‘Such as fear God and work righteousness and are doers of the law written in the heart,’ we are assured, shall be accepted and justified of God, in the day that he will judge the merits of all men by Jesus Christ, according to Paul’s gospel: and if any man bring another, let it be accursed. Amen.”¹⁴ It was a great service to Christian truth and charity, that Friends under the guidance of Penn reaffirmed the attitude of the early Greek apologists and fathers towards pre-Christian saints and sages and rejected the rigid exclusiveness of the dominant form of Calvinism. The attitude is of importance for our approach to the saints and sages of non-Christian cultures today.

If Amyraut set the door ajar for the admission of a few selected pious heathen to the Christian fellowship, Penn appears to have thrown it wide open. Was his estimate of Gentile Divinity too generous and did he claim too much for it? If all the truths necessary to salvation were known to the Gentiles through the inner light, what need was there for Christ to come in the flesh and what difference does His coming make? If the witness of the inner light before Christ was sufficient for salvation, what pur-

¹³ Penn, *op. cit.*, p. 154, and cf. pp. 280-1.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 187.

pose is served by the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ? With this problem Penn wrestles in the latter part of his treatise and to it he devotes Chapters XIV to XIX.

He states the problem in the form of an objection to his claim that the Gentiles were guided and enlightened by a light that derives from Christ. He thus formulates the position of his critics; "Certainly this light within can be, at most, but the law in the conscience, answering to the first covenant: for here is scarce any mention made of Christ in this long discourse (*i.e.*, in the preceding discussion of Gentile Divinity). And if this light was Christ, as is affirmed by you Quakers, then how comes it that he was not so called of old by the Jews and Greeks? And why typified to come, when he was come before, and whilst typified? And farther, in what sense can he be understood to bear our iniquities, and men and women to be saved by his blood, if this light be the Saviour, Messiah, Christ, etc., as you believe, and endeavour to maintain now in the world?"¹⁵ Such questions may seem remote from the modern mind. Vulliamy says, "it is impossible for any one at the present day to be interested in these dissertations: they represent a type of theological argument which has gone out of fashion and which no one need regret."¹⁶ Similarly J. W. Graham, having cited the objection in full, remarks that "several chapters are occupied in replying to this in detail, but they do not fit to our thinking and the objection itself is only given here to show the kind of argument current at the time. It would appear that theological writing is subject to a heavy death-rate."¹⁷ Of Chapter XVIII, entitled "a confession, in particular, to redemption, remission, justifica-

¹⁵ *Ibid*, p. 238-9

¹⁶ Vulliamy, William Penn, p. 104.

¹⁷ Graham, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

tion, and salvation by Christ," in which Penn sets forth the spiritual values and benefits of Christ's death, Graham says "it is a long chapter, but it is written without enthusiasm, and one has the feeling that the author is making admissions and granting concessions to tradition all through. It is extremely difficult to find in the voluminous paragraphs a very clear connection between these ordinary orthodox Christian positions and the Gospel of the Light Within."¹⁸ Vulliamy and Graham are justified in pointing out that the questions and Penn's answers are couched in terms that are no longer familiar. Yet in substance the issues involved are neither dead nor negligible. What is the relation of the Gospel of the Light Within to ordinary orthodox Christian positions? Does it assume and affirm them? Does it reject them? Does it modify them? And there is a deeper issue than that. Tradition, to which Penn is supposed to be making concessions, is manifold. It may mean traditional Christian doctrines of the Incarnation and Atonement. It may also mean the historic facts of the life and death of Jesus in which Christianity takes its rise. Apart altogether from orthodox critics, one who believes in a universal saving light is bound to ask himself, what does the historic Jesus mean to me? If Penn writes without enthusiasm on this subject and if it is difficult to find any clear connection between his account of the light within and the orthodox Christian positions asserted in Chapter XVIII, then he has failed in his main task. He has not shown that the Quaker is and must be a whole-hearted Christian.

I do not think Penn has completely succeeded in what he set out to do, but I do not think he has utterly failed, nor does his answer seem to me as inadequate and irrelevant to modern minds as some of his biographers suppose.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

Penn's problem then is this: if the light within as seen in Gentile Divinity was sufficient for salvation, why should Christ come and what difference does his coming make? In answering it, Penn would first emphasize his agreement with Amyraut. He is asserting that men in all ages have had a belief in God and some knowledge of him, "though not upon equal discovery." If he calls the light within "Christ," he does so to bring out the fact that the nature of the Light does not change. Whatever degree of enlightenment men possess is of and from Christ. When Christ comes in the flesh, then partial discoveries of truth are completed, and the light which shone dimly and uncertainly in pre-Christian times shines eminently and gloriously in Christ himself. Penn's use of the term "eminently" in this connection has a suggestion of scholastic philosophy about it.¹⁹ Just as qualities and virtues in man may be attributed eminently or in full perfection to God, so the qualities of the light within in prophet and sage before Christ exist eminently or in full perfection in Christ. But the description of the universal saving light as sufficient remains ambiguous and misleading. Presumably what is meant is that those who obey the measure of light vouchsafed to them will find it sufficient for their personal salvation, and this we must believe. But it may be taken to mean that the truths revealed apart from the historic Christ are the essential truths of all religion for all time, and this Gentile Divinity is sufficient for the salvation of all men, without any further revelation through Christ. If Penn meant this, then George Keith was right when he said this is "plain Deism appearing with open face." Penn's actual doctrine is parallel to Amyraut's hypothetical universalism. Orthodox Calvinism declared that Christ died only for the elect. Amyraut insisted that

¹⁹ See especially Penn, *op. cit.*, p. 256.

Christ died for all. "*Christum mortuum esse sufficienter sed non actualiter pro omnibus.*" Christ died *sufficiently* though not actually for all. Penn reproduces Amyraut's teaching when he speaks of the work that Christ had to do in the body, "which was actually to the salvation of some then, and intentionally of the whole world, then, and in ages to come."²⁰ The benefits of Christ's death are thus intentionally universal and sufficient for all men, though actually appropriated only by some. Penn asserts a similar hypothetical universalism for the saving power of the light within. "The life was the light of all men, but not therefore the life of all men spiritually, and unitedly considered: that was the peculiar privilege of those only who believed in it and walked up to it."²¹ The life that is the light shines sufficiently, but not actually for all.

The light within is then sufficient in its nature for the salvation of all men but in actual history this pre-Christian discovery of truth has not saved very many. We are faced with a strange paradox. The light within is at once sufficient and insufficient. We cannot but ask, how has God dealt with this situation? Penn is clear as to the answer. "Alas! there had never been so much need of many exterior dispensations and appearances of God, in reference to religion, so much preferred by the professors of this day, had not men's minds been departed from the inward light and life of righteousness; so that they being outward and abroad, God was pleased to meet them in some external manifestations: yet so, as to turn them home again to their first love: to that light and life that was given of God, as the way and guide to eternal salvation."²² Penn is thinking here of the external observations and or-

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 259.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 161. (Text of first edition of *The Christian Quaker*)

²² *Ibid.*, p. 154-5.

dinances enjoined on the Jews as figures and shadows of the good things to come, but he also seems to count the coming of Christ in the flesh among the ways in which God meets men in the outward. "The scripture speaks forth . . . parabolically . . . the inward substance and hidden life of things, by things more exterior and obvious to the sense, to the end that such mysteries might be the better accommodated to vulgar capacities." ²³ The incarnation is in line with this characteristic of the Scripture. The body or holy manhood of Christ is the instrument whereby the divine life reveals itself to vulgar capacities, to men who are outward and abroad. "Ultimately and chiefly, not wholly and exclusively, the divine life in that body was the Redeemer: for the sufferings of that holy body of Jesus had an engaging and procuring virtue in them, though the divine life was that fountain from whence originally it came." ²⁴

That, as Penn in effect asserts, it was the indirect and ultimate purpose of the external observances enjoined on the Jews and the direct and immediate purpose of Christ's coming in the outward, in historic actuality, to make man's relation to God inward and personal, I cannot doubt. But he seems to me to be strangely blind to the significance of his admission that "men being outward and abroad God was pleased to meet them there in some external manifestations." Had he reflected on it, he might have realised that Friends were pressing the distinction of inward and outward too hard. Inward and outward are as inseparable as convex and concave in a circle. The Gentile Divinity which he attributes entirely to the light within, itself depends on God's being pleased to meet men in some external manifestations, particularly in the order

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 265.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 265

of nature. But from his own standpoint, Penn recognizes that God has taken further action to supplement the witness of the light within, in order to recall men who have wandered from their first love and in order to accommodate the mysteries of the divine life to vulgar capacities. Yet Penn treats this further action as if it were a regrettable temporary concession to human weakness, and he is not lost in wonder at this amazing revelation of the condescending love of God. There is almost a touch of the unconverted aristocrat about the reference to vulgar capacities. God stoops to enter in at lowly doors, and Penn records the fact with measured caution rather than enthusiasm. It is a real failure. Yet when he speaks of "the engaging and procuring virtue in the sufferings of that holy body of Jesus," he is not merely making concessions to tradition. He is clinging to a mystery of divine love which he knows we must never surrender.

Penn's failure to appreciate the popular appeal of the Scripture and the truth embodied in the story of Jesus is reflected in his overestimate of Gentile Divinity. Like the apologists and the school of Alexandria, he recognizes the kinship between Christianity and the findings or aspirations of Greek philosophy. Socrates and Plato are Christians before Christ and the gospel of Jesus embodies the profoundest convictions of the greatest religious teachers of Greece regarding God, virtue, and immortality. But Penn does not note, as Justin Martyr and Origen do, that Socrates and Plato spoke only to the condition of the educated and leisured few, whereas Jesus Christ touched the hearts of the many. In reviving the tradition of the Greek Fathers, Penn stressed the parallel they drew between their new faith and their old philosophy, but he ignored the difference of which they were equally conscious.

Then it must be confessed that Penn's outline of Gentile Divinity bears an eclectic and artificial character. The comparative study of religions and philosophies must take into account a wider range of facts than were available for Penn, but even in his day it was a dubious procedure to treat the best that could be gleaned from Greek thinkers as if it represented a body of divinity impressed on all men by the light within. Even as an account of Greek theology and ethics, it is too flattering, and Penn might well have taken to heart some of the qualifications advanced by Amyraut in his appraisal of Greek and Roman morality. Penn admits that the Gentile Divinity he outlines was tarnished in many of the philosophers by some self-admixtures, but he occasionally edits his sources to give the most favorable impression. Thus in his selection of apothegms of Pittacus, taken from Stanley's History (Part I, p. 76), he cites: "Love thy neighbour. Reproach not thy friend, though he recede from thee a little,"²⁵ but he does not add, as Stanley does, "nor wish well to thy enemy, it is against reason"! Gentile Divinity appears as it does in his pages precisely because Penn approached the subject as a Christian, with Christian standards of judgment and with a Christian resolve to see only the best in pre-Christian thinkers.

Did Penn regard his four points of Gentile Divinity as constituting the essentials of religion for all time, a kind of eternal gospel? If he did, he certainly laid himself open to George Keith's attack. It is flat deism. Certainly some of the expressions he uses are hard to understand in any other sense and hard to defend. I think there is some force in Keith's criticism of Penn's definition of a general rule of faith and practice. "The general Rule as defined by Penn is not in existence and

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 215.

never has existed since church and world were distinguished." If Gentile Divinity be held to constitute such a general rule, it does not include all that Christians believe or ought to believe. It may cover all the truths we may expect men to arrive at, apart from the knowledge of the historic Christ; it does not include, as Keith saw, the contents of the Apostles' Creed which cannot be set on one side as of no moment. All the truths included in Gentile Divinity are essential to the salvation of mankind, but not all the truths essential to man's salvation are included in Gentile Divinity. Again, Keith seems to me right when he says we cannot speak of the inner light in a wider sense as the general rule of faith and practice. If by the inner light we mean, as we ought to mean, the Spirit's inward evidence and testimony, this is indeed the essential form of judgment. But a rule of faith consists of credenda, of things to be believed, and the Christian credenda must rest upon the witness of Scripture. Penn's antithesis of Scripture and the light within as alternative rules of faith is most unfortunate, though incidentally he says many things that are well worth saying particularly about the limitations of the Scriptures and the mistake of regarding the letter of Scripture as a final standard of belief and conduct. We have to judge in the light of the Spirit's evidence and testimony, but the matters to be judged are objectively presented and externally witnessed. We cannot dispense with the Scriptures or even treat them as secondary. The authority of Church tradition may be regarded as secondary or tertiary for that matter. For the origin and nature of Christianity, the Scriptures must remain a primary authority.

The difficulty of Penn's position may be illustrated from a passage already quoted, where he says, "God was pleased to meet men in some external manifestations: yet so as

to turn them home to their first love, to that light and life which was given of God, as the way and guide to eternal salvation." This may suggest that men were to turn back to what they might have learned if they had obeyed the light, to return to that measure of light previously granted to them. This would mean returning to the truths of Gentile Divinity as to a kind of norm or ideal. If this is what Penn meant, it is an inadequate gospel. If however he means that God by his outward manifestations was calling men to inward, personal communion with Himself, this is true and gloriously true. But this means a deeper fellowship with God resulting from the fact that he has been pleased to meet us in the outward.

What Penn lacked was an adequate conception of the *history* of salvation. I think we Friends still lack it. *The Christian Quaker* was at least a resolute attempt to grapple with this problem in the thought-forms of seventeenth century theology. Has not the time come to renew the attempt in the light of modern knowledge?

William Penn, Constitution Maker

Francis R. Taylor

"God hath given it to me; He will bless it and
make it the seed of a nation."

—WILLIAM PENN

II

WILLIAM PENN, CONSTITUTION MAKER

Constitutional theory and practice are the constant justification of that school of thought which regards a period of history as part of a flowing stream rather than as a still pool. The actor of a great part at any given time can best be judged and appraised by the shallows and deeps, both above and below. What he inherits may handicap him or inspire him. What he hands on may represent mere conformity to past tradition, with little or no vision to qualify it, or it may represent imagination, unleashed to amplify and enliven the present with the living past. The traditional attitude is often, if not always, respectable; imagination may indicate genius and involve suffering, or may drivel out into painless ineptitude. If imagination lacks practical application, it may smolder for years, before the inspiration of the seer strikes fire into the spirit of the man of action. If, however, genius and action are combined in one personality, the consequent unity bodes superlative good or ill for humanity, according to the nature of the underlying ethic.

William Penn combined in his versatile nature both the seer and the man of action. He lived in a turbulent time. Had he so chosen, he could have cloistered his religion at Worminghurst and the world would have been the richer by a few pamphlets only. He did not, however, so choose; in fact, a man of his temperament naturally could not so choose. He was throughout his early and middle years active in all phases of that turbulent time,

except the military, and even in that, he made a start. He was at the same time, a scholar, a philosopher, a theologian and a voluminous author; his learning developed the statesman from the politician, and both of these callings came into practical application in New Jersey and Pennsylvania. As a minister of the Gospel and an apostle to Europe, he rounded out his marvelous endowment—the more marvelous because he was the practical man of action in every phase of it. Every side of his character nurtured his variety of interests. His ministry in Germany brought settlers to his colony; his political adroitness and manifest sincerity safeguarded his Holy Experiment and the lives of dissenters; above all, his statecraft blazed the way for religious and political liberalism far into the future.

In dealing with Penn's place in constitutional history, the stream of events requires a backward glance, introductory to the rapids and whirlpools of his own period, just as later, a true appreciation of his work necessitates a review of events subsequent to it to fix its significance.

I.

Modern constitutional development began with the Protestant Reformation. In order to combat 'a divine Church, Luther was forced, by logic, to find divine qualifications in his conception of the State. From such a fortuitous circumstance can be traced the elements of nationalism in politics (with imperialism in the near offing) and denominationalism in religion. The ancient and sacred identity of Church and State lingered on for decades, steadily declining in virtue and virility under the disintegrating force of these new factors.

The State, having previously fulfilled the bidding of

the Church, not only recognizing but sustaining by force of arms its temporal power, was gradually and logically transformed by Luther's philosophy and action into the dominant factor. The Lutheran Church, within the framework of the German duchies and principalities, formed the norm to which Holland and the Scandinavian countries conformed. Henry VIII in England followed suit, with the Anglican Church to buttress his nationalistic aspirations.

The wars, which formerly were dynastic (in the name of religion) became, under various cloaks, essentially nationalistic. Colonization carried the state religion to the antipodes, supported by wanton exploitation, privateering and piracy. It operated under a thin veneer of missionary devotion, mostly Catholic. However, the Protestant keynote of individualism, all unwittingly, had set the forms that were to dominate religion and politics from Luther's time to this very day—namely, denominationalism and nationalism.

Penn was born in 1644, the year before Cromwell's first great victory at Naseby. The massive ambitions of Louis XIV, the crumbling empire of Charles V of Spain, Catholics both, had been matched in the field by the desperate resistance of the Protestant Low Countries and the brilliant diplomacy of the House of Orange. Cromwell's vigorous foreign policy coincided in time with the development of great numbers of little denominations. At the same time, events were shaping themselves for the Restoration and the renewal of Stuart vacillation in both internal and foreign affairs. This long period of testing and uncertainty, from the accession of Charles I (1625) to the flight of James II (1688) constituted the proving ground of fundamental change in English constitutional theory and practice. Profound as these changes were, they

did not alter at all the increasing prominence of the nationalistic State and State Church. The emphasis accumulated with every shift in politics and religion. Constantly the State waxed stronger at the expense of a weaker and more subservient Church.

To the seventeenth century European statesman, whether Protestant or Catholic, a separation of Church and State was as abhorrent as treason itself. The growth and numerical increase in the numbers of small denominations was regarded as a pest. In England, where, since Henry VIII, the King had been the head of both Church and State (later, under the Stuart conception, by divine right), the unity of the two was of even deeper importance than upon the continent. For in France and Spain the Papacy, with all its acknowledged temporal powers, was still a separate entity, however closely interrelated the functions of Pope and King were.

But in England, the unity of Church and State obtained to a degree nowhere else achieved. German Protestantism had a score of Electors, Princes and Dukes to consider. The Church even thrived, at times, by their jealousies and quarrels. Louis XIV, the most powerful European monarch of his time, recognized the spiritual and temporal power of the Pope, but in practice, qualified the temporal power as occasion demanded. The Protestant Low Countries, like the German States, lacked a clear theory of the headship of the Church.

All the while, with a Catholic court, England, essentially Protestant, was the storm center of Papal intrigue, through both war and royal marriages. Only by realizing that fact, can the plots, schemes and religious and political revolts of the Stuart period be understood. Just as England's break with the Pope had been the most complete,

so the Catholic effort to reclaim the loss was the most subtle and determined.

Such conservative efforts to return to "normalcy" always breed the counterthrust of latent or violent revolution. In England, the armed revolution was fought out under Cromwell to an indecisive finish. The religious revolution, coincident in time, ran its intensive course of individualism, with many excesses and in the great multiplication of small sects. All the while the established Church clung desperately to its financial and political privileges. It presented no inspiration to conserve the spiritual loyalties of a populace, economically uncomfortable and religiously unsympathetic. The first real crystalization of political reform came, twenty years after the Civil War had ended, in the accession of William and Mary, the Bill of Rights and the feeble, but significant Toleration Act, all in 1689.

It was through this maelstrom of politics and religions that William Penn studied, wrote, preached and acted, between those student days at Christ Church and the establishment and development of Pennsylvania. As a member of a distinctly individualistic sect, his part in the constitutional changes of the period is very significant.

II.

The political and religious *events* of any period qualify and in turn, are qualified by the philosophy prevalent at the time.

When Penn entered Christ Church, Oxford, in 1660, the dominant political philosophy was that of Thomas Hobbes. Born in 1588, Hobbes spent most of his life as a tutor to the sons of English nobility. In 1646, he was for a time tutor to the young Charles II. For the entire

period of the English Civil War he lived in Paris, fear of persecution from Parliament preventing his return.

He spent much of this time in study, attempting to understand the chaotic forces clashing in England, between King and Parliament. In 1651, he returned to England, made his peace with the Cromwellian government and published his masterpiece, "Leviathan, or the Matter, Form and Power of a Commonwealth, Ecclesiastical and Civil." Three years later he published another work on political philosophy, "Of Liberty and Necessity."

Hobbes was sixty-three years of age, at the publication of "Leviathan," a mature scholar, familiar with every phase of conservative statecraft.

His political philosophy, though long considered out-moded, has in these days a distinctly modern connotation. He insisted upon the complete separation of theology and philosophy, and as a corollary thereto, not only in the separation of Church and State, but in the subordination of the Church to the State. Having viewed from abroad the execution of an English king, the waging of a civil war and the seating of the Lord Protector as the head of a Presbyterian state, his thinking led him along unprecedented lines to conclusions both novel and startling to the Englishman of his day. By no other philosophy could he explain to himself the progress and event of a great internal civil war which apparently had upset conclusively (for he wrote before the Restoration) every fundamental concept of the previously existing English constitution.

Hobbes banished Luther's idea of the divine church in the divine state. Hobbes' state, *Leviathan*, was a "self-actuating, mortal god," subject to no spiritual rule, but swallowing all opposition ruthlessly, and governing according to pleasure or caprice, with its sole concern in the peace and security of its own subjects.

Leviathan was the seventeenth century expression of fascism. The book created a tremendous impression, notwithstanding the Restoration in 1660, after which the aging Hobbes attached himself to the fortunes of the Duke of Devonshire. This classic (for it still remains such) was the foremost work on politics and statecraft when Penn, the young idealist, gazed through the mulioned windows of Christ Church, meditating on Isaiah's prophecy of the Messiah who "shall build my city and let go my captives."

Realistic old men who had experienced the Civil War agreed with Hobbes. 'Twas ever so! But youth need not attorn. For with youth, two or three decades after the "conclusion" of a war, really lie the issues of the conflict. Penn must have read "Leviathan." Every student of affairs must have read it, even in an Oxford as gay and reckless as it was during Penn's short incumbency as a very young student, wavering between seriousness of purpose and adolescent indecorum. Perhaps he even then realized that Isaiah and Hobbes did not march.

For another man, laden with England's destiny, had returned to Oxford during those same years, to study medicine—a man forty-four years younger than Hobbes and twelve years older than Penn. For nearly thirty years John Locke was closely affiliated with Oxford, though he never took his degree in medicine. Outside events were too enthralling and his true bent really led to philosophy and education. For though he published nothing noteworthy until 1680, he, too, undoubtedly read "Leviathan" and participated in the rapid succession of events that stirred England's political and religious life to the depths.

For Englishmen were re-examining their own fundamental institutions as never before. The weak foreign policy of the Stuarts was humiliating, the more so because

their Catholic sympathies made England the pawn of Louis XIV. Like Hobbes, Locke studied civil and political affairs from the vantage point of Holland. He had been a follower of Lord Shaftesbury and when the latter fled abroad in 1685, after Monmouth's rebellion, Locke also found the Continent a safer place of abode for the immediate future.

In 1669, Shaftesbury (then Lord Ashley) had been one of the nine proprietors of the new American colony, Carolina. To John Locke, as a member of Ashley's train, was assigned the task of drafting its first charter. This state paper is indicative of Locke's political philosophy when aged thirty-seven. In this Carolina Charter there is little indication of the liberal. To be sure, Lord Ashley was President of the Council for Plantations and both he and Locke would have been subject to ultra-conservative influences to frame the Carolina charter in accord with Stuart political ideas. The same observation applies, however, as we shall see later, to Penn's "Frame of Government" for Pennsylvania, a document of astounding liberalism, in spite of the conservative royal Charter behind it.

Be those influences what they were, Locke's Carolina charter is primarily based upon a feudal conception. It reflects little or nothing of his later political, religious and educational liberalism, expounded in his two great essays on government, published *during and after* Penn's efforts in practical constitution making and operation.

In Carolina, Locke found the only practical application he ever attempted of his political theories. Contrary to Penn's benevolent proprietary basis, subject to democratic control, Locke set up an aristocratic feudalism. It recognized the institution of slavery, already in existence, and restricted the franchise to land-owners of at least fifty

acres. While this qualification would not have been particularly burdensome in the earliest days, with land cheap and abundant, almost for the asking, the difficulty was enhanced because the rights of the landlords were hereditary. The non-landholders constituted a subservient class, designated as "leet-men" and their status also was hereditary—"The children of leet-men shall be leet-men, and so to all generations." Below the leet-men in this feudal pyramid were the slaves, who had no rights at all, the slave owners having absolute power of life and death over them. The Church of England alone was supported, under this Charter, by the State, although all religions were tolerated under it. The provision, of all others that would have disquieted Penn, in Locke's constitutional effort, was the practical abolition of trial by jury, and this, after the stalwart stand of Bushel and his associated jurymen in the famous trial of William Penn and William Mead. As Penn wrote to James Logan about his own later constitution making—"It was not to be thought that a colony and a constitution of government made by and for Quakers, would leave themselves out of so essential a part of the government as juries."

Comparing this Carolina Charter with Locke's later writings, it is by no means an overstatement of the situation to claim for William Penn a crucial influence upon John Locke in formulating the democratic ideal of "consent" in the great philosopher's concepts of the origin and basis of governmental power.

Only twelve years intervened between the Carolina Charter of 1669 and Penn's "Frame of Government," drafted in 1681 and instituted in 1682. But therein lay a distinction that is all too rarely stressed. Carolina, like Pennsylvania and Maryland, was a proprietary grant. The distinction between their later histories lies, not so much

in their original royal charters, as in the liberalizing of the proprietary provisions *under* the royal charters.

The *Charter* which Penn received from Charles II on March 4, 1681 (gayly bedizened on parchment, decorated with a portrait of the King and each line underscored in red ink) was in most items a conservative document. It had been prepared by the King's ministers, of whom Francis North (Lord Keeper Guilford), was the chief. This man is described by Lord Campbell¹ as "selfish, cunning, sneaking and unprincipled, his only restraint was a regard to his own personal safety. Throughout his whole life, he sought and obtained advancement by the meanest arts." The whole political aim of Lord North (or Lord Guilford as he is as frequently termed) lay in catering to the royal prerogative, with a sycophancy that is as disgusting in history as it was disastrous to the Stuarts, whom he served. Says Lord Campbell, "Some of his notes which he had written, are in the most wretched style and show that he was unacquainted with the first principles of English composition and even with the common rules of grammar."

It is hardly surprising therefore that the royal Charter to Penn stressed the King's prerogative far beyond the provisions in Lord Baltimore's Charter of 1632 and the Carolina Charter from Locke and Shaftesbury in 1669. The royal prerogative was North's solvent for all the ills of the times.

The primary check upon Penn, in this charter, was a reservation to the King and Privy Council of power to review and veto any law passed in the colony; even more significant, in the light of the taxation struggle a century later in the American Revolution, the right of taxation

¹ *Lives of the Lord Chancellors* (Ed. 1847) III, 338, 382.

in Pennsylvania was reserved to Parliament.² These reservations were to prove of woeful import to the Proprietor in the days of William and Mary. It is little wonder that a charter fostered by such a man as North presented the most conservative features of all the colonial grants.

These items, however, were of but latent significance to young William Penn in the first flush of his proprietary enthusiasm. If they were hampering in fundamentals, he would liberalize them in practice, for truly the Charter invested him with large powers. The Colony was distant and of untried possibilities. Even Penn's exuberance never guessed the tithe of its riches, and at the worst, it was a haven, three thousand miles across the sea from the jails of England. The conservative features of North's work as Lord Chancellor on this charter proved the best justification of Penn's philosophy—"Governments, like clocks, go from the motion men give them; and as governments are made and moved by men, so by them are they ruined too. Wherefore, governments rather depend upon men than men upon governments." Perhaps distance from England, with liberal and benevolent administration would minimize the royal prerogative.

Moreover, the Charter made him absolute proprietor, by free and common socage only, and without military tenure, with an annual rent to the King of two beaver skins and one-fifth of such gold and silver as might be discovered. In reality, his own relations to his colonists were what mattered, in his mind, and those he would make so liberal that none could possibly complain.

It is interesting to speculate upon those earnest conferences at Worminghurst in England's beautiful Surrey, between Penn, his friends and advisers, during those pre-

² It is interesting to note that Lord Chancellor North was the great-grandfather of Lord North, the subservient First Lord of the Treasury under George III, and of odious repute in American history.

paratory months in 1681. Those student days at Oxford would have come surging in, redolent with memories of Sir Thomas More and his "Utopia," for had not More, a century and a half before, treaded the same cloisters of New College (later Christ Church) and studied law at Lincoln's Inn? And then there was the haunting persuasiveness of Harrington's idealistic "Oceana" (1656), so recent an addition to the idealism of political constitutions which Plato of old had started with his "Republic"!

And so amid many councillors, the "Frame" was wrought out, to be presented to the free men of the prospective colony, for their "advice, assent and approbation." After all, the enterprise was not entirely new and untried. The "Concessions and Agreements" of West Jersey were even then working satisfactorily on the East bank of the Delaware and three thousand colonists had already been attracted to settle there. Penn's faith in popular control, abundantly eager at the start, was justified in after years by the thousands who flocked to the "virgin settlement" in Pennsylvania, even though it cost mental anguish and financial loss through what he considered their ingratitude.

And when all the many suggestions were merged from the numerous drafts into the "Frame of Government" and the "Laws agreed upon in England," had been transcribed, the result showed a great coalescence of the new and the old. Too conservative in Penn's reservation of power to himself to suit Benjamin Furly of Holland and Sidney, so frequently in counsel, yet its first and great provision of religious liberty reflected the lessons of three decades of Quaker sufferings. George Fox and Josiah Coale would have buttressed him in this item. They had seen with their own eyes this new country a decade before and could actually describe its lordly rivers and densely wooded valleys to him. Yes, religious liberty there should be.

Curious though, was it not, that the King should have provided that if a score or more freemen petitioned the Bishop of London to send them an Anglican clergyman, he would be permitted to reside and officiate among them freely? How ironical must that provision have seemed to the Quaker councillors, many of them fresh from prison experiences!

The New England Puritan had achieved *his* "freedom to worship God" acceptably to himself by proscribing all other types of worship. Commenting upon a similarly exclusive *Quaker* policy, Penn scouted the idea. "If the coming of others," he says, "shall overrule us that are the originals and made it a country, we are unhappy that it is not to be thought we intended no easier nor better terms for ourselves in going to America, than we left behind us." Or, as he later wrote in 1683 (and in less muddled English) to an English Friend advocating exclusively Quaker control—"We should look selfish and do that which we have cried out upon others for, namely, letting nobody touch our government but those of their own way." Oh! marvelous consistency!

The liberal provisions of Penn's successive charters for Pennsylvania have been described so frequently and fully in the many lives of Penn that we need not go into greater detail regarding them here.³ The whole "Frame of Government" revolved around the then novel ideal of religious and political self determination, to a fuller extent than had been tried in any of the colonies except Rhode Island.

The democratic ideals of Penn and his Quaker advisers had swept far ahead of Shaftesbury's Carolina provisions and had swept John Locke along with them. Penn's

³ For the best analysis of Penn's charters, see William R. Shepherd's *History of Proprietary Government in Pennsylvania* (1896).

Holy Experiment, in spite of its faults, its weaknesses, its failures and heartaches, was the working laboratory for the great political philosopher, whence he evolved his later theories that were to affect so profoundly the thought and action of Jefferson, the Adamses, Mason, Patterson, Franklin and Wilson in the Constitutional Convention a century later.

Nay more! When William Penn wrote, "I put the power in the people," he stated the essence of that doctrine of popular and constantly renewed consent, only vaguely envisaged in John Locke's "First Treatise of Government" (1680) but clearly and boldly defined in his "Second Treatise" (1688) and woven into the enduring fabric of the English Constitution as the Bill of Rights (1689).

How closely akin to the experiment on the Delaware do those innovations, ("prepared by the convention of the Commons, assented to by the Lords and by William and Mary") sound with their restraint upon the power of the Crown; their interdict of excessive fines, bail, punishments and irregular juries, and their establishment of freedom of speech and of the right of petitioning. The reverberations of the English Bill of Rights in 1689 will be heard later in the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787 and thereafter (and from Pennsylvanians) in the adoption of its first Ten Amendments. Truly the most sacred part of any constitution, the guarantee of human rights, flows through William Penn and John Locke into the broader expanse of world politics.

The underlying thesis of both of Locke's two great works is opposition to Hobbes. There was none of this apparent in 1669 in the Carolina charter. This element, although evident in 1680 when Locke published his "First Treatise of Government" was veiled, rather than forth-

right. He was struggling with the bases of religious liberty then, toleration at least, but liberty as the ideal. He inveighed against Hobbes "for making the Church the handmaid of the sovereign State," but he was still far behind the position which William Penn and several other Quakers had taken in 1671, in addressing from Newgate Prison the "High Court of Parliament" that great plea—"though we cannot comply with those laws that prohibit us to worship God according to our consciences, as believing it to be His alone prerogative to preside in matters of faith and worship, yet we both own and are ready to yield obedience to every ordinance of man relating to human affairs, and that for conscience sake."

And it was during this same imprisonment in Newgate in 1671, that Penn wrote his "Great Case of Liberty of Conscience once more briefly Debated and Defended by the Authority of Reason, Scripture and Antiquity," in which occurs that noble manifesto which must ever remain the ultimate reliance of Christian conscientious objection to civil power—"by patience to outweary persecution, and by our constant sufferings seek to obtain a victory more glorious than any our adversaries can achieve by all their cruelties."

But Locke's "Second Treatise of Government," composed in Holland between 1685 and 1688, finds him with assurance proclaiming the ripe fruit of his studious life. But note the intervening events. His great liberal patron, Shaftesbury, had died in exile in Amsterdam in 1683; he had assisted Penn in formulating his Frame of Government for Pennsylvania, a constitution which was actually in practical operation in that far off infant colony; and, probably most impressive of all, James II was tottering to the end of his ill-starred reign. Protestant English emissaries were already notoriously in Holland soliciting Wil-

liam of Orange and his Stuart wife, Mary, to accept the English throne. Well, indeed, could Locke's vividly analytical mind ponder these events and forecast the State of the future founded upon the "consent of the governed," and that strange thing that Mr. Penn had written about his Charter—"For the matter of liberty and privilege, I propose that which is extraordinary, and to leave myself and successors no power of doing mischief; so that the will of one man may not hinder the good of the whole country."

And then too, his mind would recur to those conferences only a few years before, when he was urging upon Penn more conservative and aristocratic provisions in his "Frame of Government" while at the same time Algernon Sidney, "the first true English Republican," was pressing, with a vehemence that finally ended in coolness between him and Penn, a republican form of government!

Yes, those thoughts would recur to the great exiled philosopher, of the firm young Quaker, with whom he had conferred in the study at Worminghurst, conferring also with many other Quakers, the humble as well as the more learned, and then writing in the Preface to his "Frame of Government"—"Government seems to me a part of religion itself, a thing sacred in its institution and end." And so that "Frame" exists today, in the archives of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, in Penn's handwriting, interlined with notes and comments in the script of Locke and Sidney.

For Sidney, too, would have been freshly in Locke's mind—Algernon Sidney, son of the Earl of Leicester and another friend of Penn, the Quaker—poor, vindictive, lamented Sidney, who was beheaded in London in 1683, for alleged complicity in the Rye House Plot. Locke's thoughts, as he mused over the opening paragraphs of his

"Second Treatise" would have envisaged that intractable Sidney whom Penn had vigorously supported in his two campaigns for a seat in Parliament. In both of them he had been elected after hard and bruising experiences by both Penn and himself—elected but as well rejected each time and thrown out; and this was the Sidney who had been the most notorious and redoubtable of the regicides and who had excoriated Penn and deserted him in high dudgeon because Penn retained too much power for himself in that self-same "Frame of Government" which Locke had criticised as foolishly liberal. For had not Penn dedicated his "Frame" "to support power in reverence with the people, and to secure the people from the abuse of power; for liberty without obedience is confusion, and obedience without liberty is slavery!"

Surely (so our philosopher may have mused) Mr. Penn was a strange man indeed, addicted to a foolish confidence and trust in men, even ignorant men of low degree. That confidence had been early expressed, because Locke, too, knew of the "Concessions and Agreements" of West New Jersey (1676). And well he may have wondered how things were going in Pennsylvania from 1682 to 1684, during Penn's first visit to his province. Mayhap Locke had news of developments, perhaps not, but of this fact, at least, we may be certain,—Locke, as he took up his pen in 1685 to write his greatest political essay, "Second Treatise of Government" was not the Locke of the Carolina Charter. Hobbes and his "Leviathan" were ancient and uncouth; political power in its last analysis did *not* rest upon authority based upon fear, nor was the Church subservient to the State; the whole thing rested upon consent, and that too upon a continuous and constantly renewed consent of the people governed.

Moreover, Locke developed in this "Second Treatise"

a philosophical basis for the separation of powers into the supreme power, or the legislative and the executive or the administrative. That political puzzle of the Stuart reigns, the power of Parliament to legislate and the obligation of the King to enforce, becomes clear under Locke's analysis. Moreover, if the Executive balks, or if he rules without Parliament or if he oversteps his authority and trespasses upon the prerogative of the legislature, the remedy lies peacefully through the judges or violently through revolution. The separation of powers under Locke, therefore, is not merely applicable to legislative and executive but to judicial as well. Therein lies the seed that was to germinate a century later in the United States Constitution into our Supreme Court, in its classical form, a court differing fundamentally from any similar pattern in the English judicial system, because of its assumed power to veto acts of the legislative branch, if held to be inconsistent with the fundamental provisions of the Constitution itself. To Locke, more than to any other is due that unique authority of our great Supreme Court. His separation of the powers into three instead of two distinguishes the United States Supreme Court from the English supreme judicial authority in the House of Lords. It is interesting to note that President Roosevelt's agitation against the Supreme Court in 1937 tends away from the classical American adaptation of Locke's theory of the separation of powers, and toward the English constitutional theory of the absolute supremacy of the legislative branch in Parliament over both king and court.

It is impossible to escape Penn's influence in this change and development in Locke from his Carolina Charter days (1669) to the full flush of his "consent" theory of the "Second Treatise of Government." A king had been executed and a commoner had ruled for a strenuous

decade, even before Locke essayed his early feudal charter for Carolina. But thereafter another king had abdicated by well advised flight and still another king had been called into his place, by choice passing for popular. The implication was obvious. No longer did Penn's numerous pamphlets and appeals for religious liberty of conscience and his idealistic schemes for popular government appear chimerical. Religious and civil liberty, to be sure, were not accomplished facts, in an ideal sense. Actually, however, under William and Mary and their acceptance of the Bill of Rights in 1689, it may well have seemed to Locke, safe in his Dutch retreat, that momentous advances had been made. And so, as he evolved his great "Second Treatise," his mind's eye was surely upon Pennsylvania when he wrote this contrast:— "For he that thinks absolute power purifies men's blood, and corrects the baseness of human nature, need read but the history of this or any other age to be convinced of the contrary. He that would have been insolent and injurious in the woods of America, would not probably be much better in a throne." (Second Treatise of Government, p. 92).

Students of William Penn, noticing in the draft of the Great Fundamental those interlineations in Locke's handwriting, have been prone to attribute to Locke much of the liberal technique set forth in the document. Rather it would seem that the religious and civil liberty, established therein for Pennsylvania, inspired in Locke the development in the philosophy of Government, apparent in comparing his First and Second Treatise.

In point of emphasis, Penn's political philosophy falls midway between the Catholic constitutional conception of the unity of Church and State, (the Church being dominant) and the modern conflict between the constitutional conceptions of the democratic and the totalitarian

state. For this conflict, a decentralized and individualistic Protestantism, still lacking the reintegrating power of a spiritual culture, is largely responsible. It is due to no accident that Luther's ideal of the divine state has borne ripe fruit in his Protestant Germany, where today, both the Church and the conscientious individual may be suppressed as seditious or ignored as negligible, by the dominant State. Nor likewise, is it any accident that Penn's ideal of the democratic state finds its chief expression in his England and his America, where the Church, though much divided and often superficial and futile, and the individual citizen, though amazingly ineffective, are to a very large extent free.

The great Protestant task of today lies in resolving the dilemma between individual freedom, politically and religiously, and the social control and regulation of that freedom. The excessive nationalism and denominationism, resulting from the Protestant individualism, must be sublimated into an integrated culture, expressing a pervasive and unforced social and religious ideal.

We can be reasonably sure that we are "muddling through" to such an event, all the philosophers of pessimism from Schopenhauer to Spengler, to the contrary notwithstanding. The problem is easy enough to state, but difficult in the extreme to answer. So in 1680, it was as puzzling to statesmen and philosophers as it is today and in neither case was the answer in the back of the book.

We can also be sure that it will come by internal conflict of ideas and aspirations. By such a process, the peoples of Penn's time rose above their limitations and founded with him, the Holy Experiment. In the power to transcend failure, by experiment, lies the way to reintegration. Each generation must refresh its enthusiasms

and inspirations by a renewal of life—superficially a political process, actually, however, a spiritual one.

III.

The Glorious Revolution of 1688 was by no means glorious to William Penn. He had been the friend of James II. He was undoubtedly a Jacobite in sympathies—a very much more dangerous profession than that of a mere Quaker. Letters from Penn to James II in France were intercepted. He was accused of treason and, according to some of his most sympathetic biographers, was certainly guilty of duplicity. The story has so often been told, that the details here are unnecessary, except to relate the result. Penn went into retirement, even at times into hiding.

It seemed as if every possible disaster cumulated upon him at this period. An outcast from any favor in England, deprived of any revenue from his ungrateful colonists, deprived of his Irish estates by confiscation and, in 1692, of Pennsylvania itself (shades of Lord North and the royal prerogative!) by King William, and finally in the death of his wife and Springett, his first born son, he endured enough to crush any man. A marvelous thing it is that out of this depressing period came from William Penn the most far-sighted and modern evidences of constitutional statesmanship that he ever produced.

His Pennsylvania "Frame" had been created for a colonial structure; in 1693, from his retirement he entered the international field, with his justly famous "Essay Toward the Present and Future Peace of Europe," and in 1696, he evolved, ninety years before its realization, a substantial and practical outline for the union of the American colonies, based upon that great fundamental of the

present United States Constitution—interstate commerce.

The "Essay Toward the Present and Future Peace of Europe" is a truly remarkable forecast of the League of Nations. The inducement that led Penn to write it smacks amazingly of the present—"He must not be a man but a statue of brass or stone whose bowels do not melt when he beholds the bloody tragedies of this war, in Hungary, Germany, Flanders, Ireland and at sea, the mortality of sickly and languishing camps and navies, and the mighty prey the devouring winds and waves have made upon ships and men since '88."

He develops his thesis of peace through justice. "Government is an expedient against confusion; a restraint upon all disorder; just weights and an even balance: that one may not injure another, nor himself, by intemperance. . . . Government then is the prevention or cure of disorder, and the means of justice, as that is of peace." He formulates a plan for a "Sovereign or Imperial Diet," with representation roughly apportioned (curiously indicative of his idea of relative importance is allowance of twelve delegates to the "Empire of Germany" and six to England) according to "an estimate of the yearly value of the several sovereign countries."

In anticipating objections to the plan, he touches squarely a still existing obstacle—"that sovereign princes and states will hereby become not sovereign: a thing they will never endure." Moreover, he indulged in the same sportsmanlike faith in his Imperial Diet that Woodrow Wilson placed in the League of Nations—nay more the faith that England imposed in it until its foundation crumbled under it in 1935. Penn envisaged a concerted unity in conclusions that would make them self-enforcing, "no sovereignty in Europe having the power and therefore cannot show the will to dispute the conclusion."

The unity has not come, the automatic enforcement has not arrived, the fair dream of Sully, minister to Henri IV of France, of William Penn of England, of Immanuel Kant of Germany, and of Woodrow Wilson of the United States, remains unfulfilled,—but only for a season. The stars in their courses fight for it. This larger constitutional vision is certain of fulfillment in this twentieth century, if for no other reason, then for that which Penn cites in the last line of his essay, because “Europe by her incomparable miseries, makes it now necessary to be done.” For Penn also had a vision of the Great Republic which is the inevitable prototype of the League. He among the first advocated measures of union among the American colonies.

IV.

For to William Penn, after the return of his Pennsylvania to him, came one more opportunity to put the next century under obligation to him. From him, in 1696, emanated a plan for union of the American colonies upon a *representative* basis. Thereby he became, as Bancroft termed him, the “forerunner and teacher of Franklin and America.”

William III was a fighting king. His ambitions and his arms penetrated every trouble spot in Europe, and especially France. It took no great exercise of imagination for statesmen on both sides in Europe to realize the importance of colonies as instruments of imperial policy, with the result that England and France set themselves for the struggle that lasted till France was driven from the North American Continent after the French and Indian War of 1756.

The beginnings of this in Penn’s time, boded ill for his Quaker colony on the Delaware. It had seemed so inno-

cently remote in 1682. Its Indian neighbors had been so wisely and successfully appeased! Why should the reverberations of European warfare disturb the peace, security and commerce of this most favored colony? New England and New York had waged relentless warfare upon their savage neighbors; French Canada, quick to grasp her advantage, had subsidized the Iroquois for unceasing and bloody depredations along the frontiers, but why should Pennsylvania, free from complicity and proximity, be involved?

The world was decreasing in size. India and America were, willy nilly, part of the battlefields of Europe. King William could not view without concern the French encroachments upon New York. For the first time in American history, two companies of British soldiers arrived in New York in 1691. From that date until the American Revolution, the story is long and involved. It involves theories of colonial administration, taxation and defense, upon which libraries have been written. In those libraries however, little notice has been accorded to the two principal characters of this review, John Locke and William Penn, for in 1696, each was again called into the forum to suggest remedies for the lack of colonial defense. Locke was then sixty-four and Penn fifty-two years of age and both were in England.

William III formed a Board of Commissioners for Trade and Plantations, of which Locke, with both his great political works now published, was appointed a member. The Crown instructed this commission toward various ends, among the others, "to inquire into the means of making the colonies most useful and beneficial to *England*." Never were words of weightier significance referred to a Royal Commission, fraught as they were with the theory of colonial policy on far flung lines in America, Asia, Africa and Palestine.

The American situation was truly desperate. Locke and his associates reported the colonies "crumbled into little governments, disunited in interests, in an ill posture and much worse disposition to afford assistance to each other for the future." The matter required strong measures.

Penn appeared before the Board on February 8, 1697. He advocated an annual "congress" of provincial delegates, two from each (our modern Senate) with a King's commissioner as presiding officer. The congress should arrange for intercolonial administration of justice (our Federal Courts), should have power "to prevent or cure injuries in point of commerce" (our Federal interstate commerce jurisdiction) and "to consider of ways and means to support the Union, and safety of these provinces against the public enemies" (the Federal war powers). Local delegates, said Penn, would be much better able to determine quotas of men, money and supplies than London would be, "for the provinces, knowing their own condition and one another's, can debate that matter with more freedom and satisfaction, and better adjust and balance their affairs in all respects for common safety" with a final provision that, "the determination, in the assembly, I propose, should be by plurality of voices."

The Ministry, with an eye single to those things "most useful and beneficial to *England*," declined the representative principle advocated by William Penn and placed the whole administration of American quotas for defense upon the royal prerogative.

While historical speculation is as useless as it is interesting, one can be tolerated in wondering whether an adherence to Penn's life-long principle of popular representation by King William's ministry, might have turned the whole trend of English and American history. The swift drama of the next century flashes vividly into

the lives that played their great parts in constitutional developments. The stolid and unimaginative Georges, and especially the Third, magnificently mumbling personal prerogatives and totally unable to realize the ascendancy of the political principles of the North American colonies, ignored to their great cost, their Davenants, their younger Pitts and their Burkes.

Meanwhile in Boston, in 1706, Franklin, "the first American," was born, the earliest of the great galaxy of statesmen, who would dominate the principles and practice of constitutional development in the eighteenth century. The City of Brotherly Love early drew him to it, a few years after the death of its great Founder and there he imbibed the ideals of religious and civil liberty that Locke and Penn had sublimated from Hampden, Pym and Prynne and from the dungeons of the Quakers.

And there followed him in that great train, the Adamses of Massachusetts, Patterson of New Jersey, Wilson of Pennsylvania, Jefferson, Madison and Mason of Virginia, and (young enough to be Franklin's grandson) Hamilton of Nevis and New York.

The great story of these ideals, mounting in public appreciation as the years went by, finds the civil and religious ideals of Penn firmly ensconced in the framework of the United States Constitution. They had arrived through much tribulation. The English Bill of Rights had glimpsed them; Jefferson's Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom and Mason's Virginia Bill of Rights embodied them and thence they were carried by amendment into the United States Constitution itself, largely through the Virginians and the Scotch Irish settlers of the Pennsylvania frontier.

Success there had been for William Penn in his lifetime, but of difficulties, defeats, discouragements and

imprisonments there were more. That his faith rose serene and triumphant over these and that the spiritual power of his political ideals for civil and religious freedom still obtains is the best warrant for his abiding place in our constitutional history. In him the seer and man of action met.

▪

Personality Types of Two Quaker Leaders
Catharine Cox Miles

▪

CHRONOLOGY OF WILLIAM PENN

Date	Age
1644 Birth	0
1654-9 Attended Chigwell School	7
1655? First religious convictions	10?-15
1660-62 At Oxford study, sports, religious interests Expelled from College for non-conformity	11-18
1662 Travel in France and Italy Social life, theological study	18-18
1663 Studied law, Lincoln's Inn	19
1665-6 In Ireland manager of father's estate, distinction in arms, Quaker conviction	20-22
1667 First religious ministry Imprisonment Public letter appealing for freedom of conscience First publication "Truth Exalted" addressed to kings, priests and people	22-25
1667-71 Religious ministry, controversy authorship, defense of religious freedom, imprisonment Wins jury support in famous trial for liberty of conscience	23-27
1670 Inheritance of patrimony	25
1671 First missionary journey to Holland and Germany	25-52
1672-77 Continued religious and controversial activity in England	26
1672 Marriage	27
1672-75 Provincial living on wife's estate, and religious controversial writing Secures release from prison of George Fox	28-33
1676 Arbitrates dispute between Friends successive owners of a part of New Jersey Writes constitution for West New Jersey	28
1677 Additional inheritance of property Second missionary journey to Holland and Germany Twice addresses House of Commons regarding Oaths	29
1677-82 Continued religious and controversial activity, also related political activity	28-31
1679 Address to Protestants on tolerance Also two important political addresses Active support of political candidacy of Sidney	32
1681 Province of Pennsylvania secured by efforts of Penn, in payment of Crown's debt to Admiral Penn Penn's vain attempt to prevent giving of the family name to the colony	33
1681-2 Great organizing activity toward the colonizing and government of Pennsylvania Writing of constitution of conditions and concessions	33-38
1682 Elected Fellow of the Royal Society Farewell communications Voyage to America in the "Welcome" One third of the company dying of small-pox	38
1682-84 Political and social organization in Pennsylvania Indians Affairs, treaty Writing of description of Pennsylvania Return to England	38-40
1684-6 Influential activity on behalf of Quakers and other Dissenters including John Locke	40-42

CHRONOLOGY OF JOHN WOOLMAN

Date	Age
1720 Birth	0
1727 First religious convictions	7
1730-35 Attended Friends' village school	10?-15
1736 Illness Deepened religious interest	11-18
1736-40 Employed on father's farm Youthful "vanities and mirth" followed by renewed religious conviction	18-18
1740 First religious ministry	17-20
1740-42 Employed as clerk in a small store	20-22
1742-45 Tailor's apprentice Recorded a Minister (with two others, aged 36 and 38)	22-25
1743 First religious tour Spoke little	23
1743-72 Religious ministry at home and throughout the colonies	23-52
1745 First independent religious journeys Business activity as clerk, tailor, scribe, conveyancer, executor of wills, surveyor, farmer, also surgeon (blood letter)	25-52
1746 Wrote essay on slavery (published 8 years later)	26
1747 Bought two pieces of property from his earnings	27
1749 Marriage	28-33
1752 Appointed clerk of Burlington Quarterly Meeting, serving 17 years (to age 49, 1769)	28
1754 Published his paper on slavery written 8 years earlier	34
1756 Begins to write his journal	35
1757 Appointed a member of the Meeting for Sufferings Joins in protest against military service and tax One of the founders of the New Jersey Association for helping the Indians	37
1759 Preached stirringly against slave holding at Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Writes Yearly Meeting Epistle dealing with political affairs	37-38

TYPES OF QUAKER LEADERS 57

Date		Age		Date
		40	Religious mission to New England Yearly Meeting Memorialises the New England legislature to forbid slave traffic. Protests against lotteries. Appointed to aid in the revision of the N E Yearly Meeting Discipline. Illness on return home. Scruples about dress develop	1780
1686	Third missionary journey to Holland and Germany	42		
1686-90	Preaching mission through England Secures release of 1200 imprisoned Quakers. Continued writings. Vehement disavowal of Jesuit affiliations. Loyalty to King James. Addresses on King's behalf during the Revolution. Declared a "dangerous person" by Queen Mary. No evidence of treason found.	42-46		
		43	Assists two negroes to be married legally. Writes certificate and acts as witness. Preaching mission to the Indians. Persuads although warned of danger. Cooperation with the Moravians. Three weeks journey.	1763
1690-92	Death of his friends Barclay and Fox. In retirement in London	46-48	Religious missions on foot to neighboring places and to the South. Preaching against slaveholding.	1766-68
1692-3	Writing of further Quaker defences and disciplines. Deprived of Governorship of Pennsylvania. Illness of his wife. Accusation of treasonable correspondence with James II. Writing of "Fruits of Solitude". Accusations withdrawn. Public hearing and acquittal demanded and granted. Writing of "Essay toward the present and future peace of Europe".	48-49	"Considerations on Pure Wisdom and Human Policy, on labor, on schools, on the right use of the Lord's gifts".	1768-9
		49-	School for Friends' children and others (perhaps earlier). Preparation and publication of a school Primer at this time or earlier. Concern against the East India trade. Concern against the use of silverware.	1769?
1694	Death of his wife (leaving three children). Writing of "Account of the rise and progress of the people called Quakers". Again regarded by Quakers as their leader. Restored to governorship of Pennsylvania. Promises to supply money and men for the defense of the frontiers.	49-50 50	Copies his Journal. Writing of "Consideration on the true harmony of Mankind and how it is to be maintained".	1769-70 1770
1695	Preaching mission in Western England	50-52	Plans for religious mission to England. Requests certificate. Writes farewell epistle.	1770-72
1696	Second marriage. Death of his congenial son. Writes on primitive Christianity, identifying Quaker faith and practice with it.	51		
		52	Journey to England. Cold, later warm, reception, powerful sermons in London, preaching mission to Yorkshire, illness (smallpox), last entries in diary, death.	1772
1697	Residence in Bristol. Visit to Ireland on behalf of property interests.	53		
1699-1701	In Pennsylvania. Aids in suppression of piracy. Fails to win Assembly support for laws on behalf of negro welfare. Friendly relations with the Indians.	55-57	Publication of "the journal of John Woolman's life and travels in the service of the gospel".	1775
1700	New Indian treaty. Assists in consolidation of laws for American colonies. Reviews charter at Assembly's request.	56	Philadelphia Yearly Meeting disowns all members who still refuse to liberate their slaves. 1776.	
1701-18	In England. Activity followed by declining health.	57-74		
1701	Resumes position as leader of the Dissenters. Reads on their behalf address of thanks to the throne.	57		
1701-3	Writes "More fruits of solitude" while residing at Kensington.	57-59		
1703-6	Residence in Knightbridge. Writing of Life of Bulstrode Whitlock.	59-62		
1706-10	Residence at Brentford. Trouble reported from America, dissolute conduct of his son, losses and mismanagement by stewards. Refuses to pay unjust claims by his incapable and swindling steward, imprisoned.	62-66		
1710	Released from prison through financial intervention of his friends. Disputes with the Pennsylvania Assembly lead to the writing of an address "to old friends," which wins complete support and action in his interests. Bill passed prohibiting importation of negroes, cancelled by English parliament.	66		
1712	Failing health. His proposal to surrender his colonial powers to the Crown accepted. First attacks of apoplexy.	68		
1713-18	Further attacks of apoplexy gradual decline of memory and understanding. Death.	69-74		

III

PERSONALITY TYPES OF TWO QUAKER LEADERS¹

PERSONALITY STUDY IN QUAKER HISTORY

The personalities of leaders and geniuses offer focal points for studies of historical movements. A psychophysiological study of a series of Quaker leaders might reveal groupings of constitutional factors in characteristic types. However, it seems not unlikely that a diversity of types would appear notwithstanding a similarity with reference to certain religious views. The present report is an attempt to initiate a personality study of this kind by outlining for two eminent Quakers some essential elements of a psychophysiological description. The two notables selected, William Penn and John Woolman, present an obvious contrast to the most casual consideration. It has been of no little interest to the writer to observe that the contrast has persisted as it has been defined in systematic constitutional terms, and that here in these two distinguished leaders in a common movement, motivated by a common faith, the same two contrasting human types are found that have been revealed in the studies of Kretschmer and others, first in psychopaths, then in average men, and finally, as in our study, in geniuses. Kretschmer's type analysis depends upon an evaluation (1) of the life activity as revealed (a) in the career, and (b) in the written words or other products; and (2) of the physique as shown (a) in pictures or sculpture, and (b) in con-

¹ The substance of this paper was presented in a lecture given at Pendle Hill, June 1937.

temporary descriptions. I have followed this analysis pattern presenting for each of the two personalities first the chronology in a brief form, then samples of the written productions, following these with descriptions of the available pictures and other representations and summaries of contemporary characterizations. For each part of the analysis there is a brief summary and at the end of the analysis there follows for comparison a brief account in Kretschmer's terms of the personality type indicated.

WILLIAM PENN

The chronology of William Penn (see pages 56 and 57) reveals a life of ceaseless and varied activity with frequent change of work and abode, of practical utilization of fortune's gifts and society's opportunities, of optimistic daring, of humanitarian altruism, of energetic grasp of the needs of a new situation and tireless and cheerful endeavor in meeting them, and, finally, of productive philanthropic organization and leadership on a grand scale.

His personality is equally revealed in his letters and other publications. An example of unconsciously accurate self-portrayal appears in a letter written in his 37th year to his new constituents in Pennsylvania:

My Friends:—I wish you all happiness here and hereafter. These are to let you know that it hath pleased God, in his providence, to cast you within my lot and care. It is a business that, though I never undertook before, yet God hath given me an understanding of my duty, and an honest mind to do it uprightly. I hope you will not be troubled at your change, and the King's choice, for you are now fixed at the mercy of no governor that comes to make his fortune great; you shall be governed by *laws of your own making, and live a free*, and if you will, *a sober and industrious* people. I shall not usurp the right of any, or oppress his person. God has furnished me

with a better resolution, and has given me his grace to keep it. In short, whatever sober and free men can reasonably desire, for the security and improvement of their own happiness, I shall heartily comply with, and in five months resolve, if it please God, to see you. In the mean time, pray submit to the commands of my deputy, so far as they are consistent with the law, and pay him those dues [that formerly you paid to the order of the Governor of New York] for my use and benefit; and so I wish God to direct you in the way of righteousness, and therein prosper you and your children after you.

I am your true friend,

WM. PENN.

London, 8th of the month called April, 1681.

The spirit and content of this letter exhibit friendliness, simple and direct honesty, cheerful and contagious enthusiasm, rational and straightforward human understanding, a basic confidence in his own ability to understand new problems and adapt to them, and both the desire and the ability to express an inspiring interest in the welfare of his fellow human beings.

In his voluminous writings including expositions of Quaker belief, justifications of Quaker peculiarities, spirited calls to the Quaker way of life, and descriptive accounts of practical, effective, honest, altruistic Christian behavior designed to serve as models and inspirations, we may look in vain for any note of doubt, self-distrust, discouragement or incapacity. In all of his letters, essays or expositions there is a characteristic practical, homely, cheerful, comfortable common sense, magnanimity, human appreciation, expansiveness of spirit and hopeful confidence.

To the Indian sachem called "the Emperor of Canada" in appeal for cooperation he writes as follows:

The great God that made thee, and me, and all the world, incline our hearts to love peace and justice, that we may live

friendly together as becomes the workmanship of the great God. The King of England, who is a great prince, hath, for divers reasons, granted me a large country in America, which, however, I am willing to enjoy upon friendly terms with thee; and this I will say, that the people who come with me are a just, plain and honest people, that *neither make war upon others, nor fear war from others, because they will be just.*

In sorrow on the death of his son he still preserves his essential equanimity and the capacity to relate even this tragic event to a natural course of human development.

So ended the life of my dear child and eldest son, much of my comfort and hope, and one of the most tender and dutiful, as well as ingenious and virtuous youths I knew, if I may say so of my own dear child, in whom I lose all that any father could lose in a child, since he was capable of any thing that became a sober young man, my friend and companion, as well as most affectionate and dutiful child.

May this loss and end have its due weight and impression upon all his dear relations and friends, and upon those to whose hands this account may come, for their remembrance, and preparation for their great and last change, and I have my end in making my dear child's thus far public.

Optimistic regarding his own and others' achievements, he was always hopeful of even more effective endeavor given further opportunity for practice. In the introduction to the *Fruits of Solitude* he said of its author (himself):

And he verily thinks, were he to live his life over again, he could not only, with God's grace, serve Him but his neighbor and himself better than he hath done, and have seven years of his time to spare. And yet perhaps he hath not been the worst or the idlest man in the world; nor is he the oldest.

In his religious expositions and exhortations he constantly emphasizes the largeness and universality of his

faith and the greatness of the gifts of the Lord to those that love him. In the *Gospel Truths* his first pronouncement concerns God as a "rewarder." In another writing he is triumphantly hopeful that as Christ "is glorified for us, as our common head, . . . we shall, with him, be glorified too, as his members if we through patience and tribulation overcome also." And finally these heartening words:

He that made us knows our frame. He that created us and formed and fashioned us after his own image, and gave us powers and faculties to glorify and serve him, that we may come to enjoy him for ever, requires of no man or woman more than he hath given them power or ability to perform. It concerneth us all, therefore, to live in the exercise of that Divine gift, and grace and ability which our Lord Jesus Christ hath distributed and communicated to every member of his body, that we may come to shine as stars in the firmament of glory.

The portraits of Penn, with their varying degrees of authenticity, are entirely concordant with respect to his essential physical appearance. The portrait in armor shows an attractive youthful softness and roundness of the face with harmoniously moulded, balanced features. The expression is placid, friendly and open. The effigy by Bevan of an older Penn shows the rounded contours accentuated by the corpulence of age. The head is seen to be round, broad and deep, but not very high. The forehead is relatively broad, well developed, dome-shaped. The nose is of middle size, rather broad, but not flattened. There is a rich overlay of fat, concentrated mainly on the lower lateral parts of the cheeks and in the double-chin. The strong distinct character of the finely moulded features is not lost even in this corpulence, and the fundamentally important curves which give the characteristic

benignity and human kindness to the countenance are quite apparent.

Descriptions of Penn call him "tall in stature and of an athletic make." As a young man he is said to have been handsome in his person and graceful in his manners. Later, inclined to stoutness, "his appearance . . . was that of a fine portly man." He walked generally with a cane with which when dictating to his secretary he would emphasize his points by striking it against the floor. "Although he adhered to the plainness and simplicity of address peculiar to Friends, his manners were polished and courteous," for, as he said: "I know no religion which destroys courtesy, civility, and kindness, which rightly understood, are great indications of true men, if not of good Christians." He bore with good humor what was distasteful to him in his associates. It was his "remarkable urbanity, joined with sweetness of temper, ready wit, profound knowledge, and great conversational powers, that made him a welcome visitor in the salons of the great and the palaces of kings; yet such was the humility of his character, that he was no less agreeable among the yeomanry of Great Britain and the farmers of Pennsylvania."

Burnet, a political opponent, describes him as he appeared to those disposed to dislike him and all that he represented.² This adverse description confirms our impression of the essential personality traits.

Penn the Quaker came over to Holland . . . [wrote Burnet] He was a talking vain man, who had been long in the King's favor, he being the Vice-Admiral's son. He had such an opinion of his own faculty of persuading, that he thought none could stand before it; though he was singular in that opinion: for he had a tedious luscious way, that was not apt

² G. Burnet: *History of his Own Times*

to overcome a man's reason, though it might tire his patience. . . . He is a man of good parts, but extremely vain; he loves mightily to hear himself talk; he has a flourish of learning, and with it a copious fluency; and his head is much turned by the notion of government . . . Penn has been likewise a zealous promotor of liberty of conscience, which was all that the Popish party thought fit to pretend to at first; and since he was considered as a man that had the conduct of the whole party of the Quakers, and had likewise great credit with some of the leaders of the other sects, the King made great use of him, and seemed to depend much on his advice.

Burnet stands alone in his interpretation of Penn's personality, which he was obviously not able to appreciate. Janney has described Penn, introducing into his appraisal quotations from many older authorities. He states: "One of the most remarkable traits in the character of Penn was his magnanimity. With a singular disregard for selfish or personal considerations, he devoted his life to the good of mankind." He quotes from Bancroft: "This is the praise of William Penn, that, in an age which had seen a popular revolution shipwreck popular liberty among selfish factions . . . [he] did not despair of humanity, and, though all history and experience denied the sovereignty of the people, dared to cherish the noble idea of man's capacity for self-government." . . . "There is nothing in the history of the human race like the confidence which the simple virtues and institutions of William Penn inspired." Janney adds: "As a minister of the gospel, he was highly esteemed, and indefatigable in his religious duties." Clarkson stated:

Though a learned man, [Penn] used, while preaching, language the most simple and easy to be understood, and he had a happy way of explaining himself by images the most familiar. He was of such humility, that he used generally to sit at the lowest end of the space allotted to ministers, always taking

care to place above himself poor ministers and those who appeared to him to be peculiarly gifted. He was, also, no less remarkable for encouraging those who were young in the ministry.

Janney comments further as follows:

As an author of religious works, he holds a high rank among the members of his own society, and some of his writings have been well received by the public at large. His style is vigorous, his illustrations apt, and often elegant, but, like most writers of that age, his sentences are sometimes too cumbrous to suit the taste of modern readers. . . . He was methodical in the division and use of his time, which enabled him to accomplish a great amount of business without neglecting his religious duties. He wrote a paper called 'Christian Discipline,' or good and wholesome orders for the well-governing of his family, which is supposed to have been posted in some conspicuous place in his house. . . . In attention to the poor he was equalled by few, and no man was more beloved in his own neighborhood, where his name was long held in grateful remembrance.

The General Meeting of Friends in Pennsylvania used these words in memorializing their most eminent member after his decease:

His behavior was sweet and engaging, and his condescension great even to the weakest and meanest, affable and of easy access, tender to every person and thing that had simplicity of truth or honesty for a foundation.

His own Monthly Meeting in England included the following appraisal in a testimonial to his life and work:

He was a man of great abilities, of an excellent sweetness of disposition; quick of thought and of ready utterance; full of the qualifications of true discipleship, even love without dissimulation; as extensive in charity as comprehensive in

knowledge, and to whom malice and ingratitude were utter strangers—ready to forgive enemies, and the ungrateful were not excepted. . . . Had not the management of his temporal affairs been attended with some deficiencies, envy itself would be to seek for matter of accusation, and judging in charity, even that part of his conduct may be attributed to a peculiar sublimity of mind. . . . Notwithstanding which, he may without straining his character, be ranked among the learned—good—and great; whose abilities are sufficiently manifested throughout his elaborate writings, which are so many lasting monuments of his admired qualifications, and are the esteem of learned and judicious men among all persuasions. . . . In fine, he was learned without vanity; apt without forwardness; facetious in conversation, yet weighty and serious—of an extraordinary greatness of mind, yet void of the stain of ambition; as free from rigid gravity as he was clear of unseemly levity; a man—a scholar—a friend; a minister surpassing in speculative endowments, whose memorial will be valued by the wise, and blessed with the just.

PENN, THE PYKNIC

Kretschmer's description of the pyknic countenance and physique, and the cyclothymic temperament might have been prepared in the first instance as a description of William Penn. The circular or pyknic group, he says, contains individuals with full smooth faces, broad shield-shaped or five-cornered contours with harmonious construction of the profile, short necks, rounded limbs, and the pyknic tendency to fatness. Kretschmer subdivides the pyknics among average men into gay chatter-boxes, quiet humorists, silent good-tempered men, happy enjoyers of life, and energetic practical men. Among pyknic leaders and heroes he distinguishes the daring whole-hoggers and tough simple fighters, the cheerful organizers on a grand scale, and the conciliatory diplomatists, groupings any one of which might include Penn. Kretschmer states further that among geniuses who manifest "the

productive practical aspect" of the cyclothymic character "we find a number of advantageous qualities in the hypomanic-temperament: cheerful animation, optimism, daring, a quick grasp of the situation, a mobility and fluid practical energy, and then in the moderate cyclothymic natures: sound understanding of mankind, homeliness, instinct for practicality, spirit, friendly conciliatory skill in the handling of men. On the other hand the pure cyclothymic is as a rule lacking in hardness of character, idealistic excitement and logical tenacity, principles of action and method. The cyclothymic metal is, in itself, somewhat too soft. In great leaders of a prevailing cyclothymic temperament, we always find, in so far as we have been able to get a general view, important schizothymic characteristics."

William Penn had just that degree of strength, not hardness, of character, of "idealistic excitement and logical tenacity, principles of action and method" generally deficient in average pyknic men which gave him with his prevailing cyclothymic expression of personality the character of creative genius for practical leadership in a great social and religious movement. He combined extraordinary extensiveness of interest and achievement with "a versatile and fluid psychic activity" which in his writings stretches over an unusually wide range, "and yet has a strong artistic feeling for the general hanging-together of the whole." He collected a vast number of anecdotes giving examples of moral behavior, and he showed in editing them a kind of naive satisfaction in their exemplification of his principles. Although he used the typical, mystical, religious phraseology of his day, he never forgot his own essential quality as a finite human personality; in God's image, Man.

Kretschmer describes among writers the pyknic realists as follows:

They have the capacity to give anyone a good dressing down, but they are incapable of bitterness and sharp irony. . . . Homely humanity and naturalness, true-hearted nobility, the affirmative attitude to life, love for all things, that are because they are as they are, but especially for mankind itself, and its homliest manifestations, sound understanding for human beings and home-made moral judgment which values ability. . . .

In conclusion we may place beside this J. W. Graham's appraisal of Penn:

I should say that he was an expansive man, hearty, sociable, conversational, and both in speech and writing more apt to begin than to stop, a large-souled optimistic and open-hearted Friend, accessible to appeals, not critical of his fellows, not particular about money, and apt to be taken in. The centre of his faith was the divine presence in man, and such large charity as his does not go with a suspicious nature. He looked out upon the world as a friend.

JOHN WOOLMAN

Woolman's chronology reveals a high degree of continuity with a narrow restriction of interests, self-imposed limitation in activity, devotion to kinds of work in which thoroughness and exactness were essentially important, a sincere endeavor to eliminate all ordinary social recreations and ambitions from his deeds and thoughts, sympathy for human distress resulting from human oppression. The activity summarized in it further reveals simplicity and depth in all his relationships and attachments, a high, even painful, degree of spiritual sensitivity, and finally and most strikingly, profound idealism in every thought and act.

Woolman had two primary concerns or motives in his personal and social life. One was individual, the inevitable outcome of his immediate experience of a direct relationship to God. It was expressed continuously in the general form offered by the daily round and common task of life and at specific high points of experience in vocal ministry which he conceived of as offering an exceptional opportunity for especially refined and matured expression of the divine purpose. The other was social and had to do with attitudes toward fellow human beings oppressed in consequence of human selfishness. This also had, as Woolman saw it, to be worked out rigorously and laboriously in every act of daily life and had further to be vocalized specifically in preaching and writing on behalf of laborers and especially slaves.

Woolman's logic and sincerity in both concerns required of him an over-simplification of his own life to make his relationship with God a pure and unselfish one and to make his own acts accord with the simplified social conditions he was attempting to bring about. This effort seems never to have resulted in harshness or critical disparagement of others. His relationships with his relatives and friends reveal always a gentle flow of affection and kindly sentiment. In his thirty-seventh year he wrote in his diary a statement about his "worldly" business which shows his singularly systematic effort to eliminate conflicting elements from his plan of life to the furthering of the Lord's work through him and without causing distress to any.

Until the year 1756, I continued to retail goods, besides following my trade as a Taylor; about which time I grew uneasy on account of my business growing too cumbersome. I began with selling trimings for garments, and from thence proceeded to Sell cloaths and linens, and at length having got

a considerable shop of goods, my trade increased every year, and the road to large business appeared open: but I felt a Stop in my mind.

Through the Mercies of the Almighty I had in a good degree learned to be content with a plain way of living. I had but a small family [my outward Affairs had been prosperous] and, on serious reflection I believed Truth did not require me to engage in much cumbering affairs. It had generally been my practice to buy and sell things really useful. Things that served chiefly to please the vain mind in people, I was not easie to trade in; seldom did it, and whenever I did, I found it weaken me as a Christian.

The increase of business became my burthen, for though my natural inclination was towards merchandize, yet I believed Truth required me to live more free from outward cumber. There was now a strife in my mind betwixt the two, and in this exercise my prayers were put up to the Lord, who Graciously heard me, and gave me a heart resigned to his Holy will; I then lessened my outward business; and as I had opportunity told my customers of my intention that they might consider what shop to turn to: and so in a while, wholly laid down merchandize, following my trade as a Taylor, myself only, having no prentice. I also had a nursery of Apple trees, in which I spent a good deal of time, howing, grafting, triming and Inoculating.

This passage reveals singleness of aim in following his guide. It shows his feeling of stressful discomfort when he found himself involved in business that extended beyond direct necessities; his recognition of responsibility for the adequate support of his family; his apparent satisfaction in the achievement of a simple mode of life and a simple prosperity; his careful consideration for the convenience of his customers; and his final solution of his major problem by stringent lopping off of the offending elements. He would pursue his trade without an apprentice and would reduce the bulk of material objects, requiring financial and social manipulation. He would

not however give up a non-social, non-financial manipulative exercise, the cultivation of his fruit trees. By this program his sensitive, self-questioning spirit could be protected from continued outward social stimulation during business hours and so his periods at home made times of comparative mental seclusion. He could thus be free to apply himself to the difficult problems that he had undertaken to work upon, without having other, perhaps trivial matters, constantly thrust upon him. This was no doubt physically as well as spiritually essential because his missionary journeys to distant places, in later years on foot, were always times of "inward suffering" as well as bodily exertion with consequent general fatigue and lowering of somatic resistance thresholds. But it is perfectly clear that the motive was apprehended entirely as a spiritual one.

Transitional in its implication and indicative of the close relationship between everyday experience and the specifically ministerial service, as Woolman viewed it, is the following characteristically self-examining and self-humbling paragraph:

Traveling up and down of late, I have had renewed evidences that to be faithful to the Lord and Content with his will concerning me is a most necessary and useful Lesson to me to be learning. Looking less at the Effects of my labor, than at the pure motion and reality of the Concern as it arises from Heavenly Love. In the Lord Jehovah is everlasting Strength, and as the mind by a humble resignation is united to Him, and we utter words from an inward Knowledge that they arise from the Heavenly Spring, Though our way may be difficult, and require Close Attention to keep in it, And though the manner in which we are led may tend to our own abasement, yet if we continue in patience and meekness, Heavenly Peace is the reward of our Labors.

In his exposition *Concerning the Ministry* his humble devotion to his goal, realizable but never realized, is strikingly manifested.

Christ being the Prince of Peace, and we being no more than ministers, I find it necessary for us, not only to feel a concern in our first going forth, but to experience the renewing thereof in the appointment of meetings . . . Christ puts forth his ministers, and goeth before them; and Oh! how great is the danger of departing from the pure feeling of that which leadeth safely! . . . Christ knoweth when the fruit-bearing branches themselves have need of purging. Oh! that these lessons may be remembered by me! . . . I have sometimes felt a necessity to stand up; but that spirit which is of the world hath so much prevailed in many, and the pure life of Truth been so pressed down, that I have gone forward, not as one travelling in a road cast up, and well prepared, but as a man walking through a miry place, in which are stones here and there, safe to step on; but so situated that one step being taken, time is necessary to see where to step next . . . The gift is pure; and while the eye is single in attending thereto, the understanding is preserved clear; self is kept out. . . . That which is of God gathers to God; and that which is of the world is owned by the world. . . . A labor hath attended my mind, that the ministers amongst us may be preserved in the meek feeling life of Truth, where we have no desire but to follow Christ and be with him; that when he is under suffering we may suffer with him; and never desire to rise up in dominion, but as he by the virtue of his own Spirit may raise us.

The gentle mildness with which his concern regarding the keeping of slaves is generally expressed in his diary and letters does not conceal from the careful reader the pathetic distress of heart and soul that bowed down his shy empathic spirit as he contemplated the personal and social difficulties involved in the endeavor to which he had set himself and alliance with which he wished merely to

suggest to others. He made no common dogmatic pronouncements, his appeal was to the primitive individual social emotion of human kindness in his hearers, to the inward light in their hearts. Yet he had also a profound sense of an awful punishment which might come to those who neglected to follow their Light.

Negroes are our Fellow Creatures, and their present Condition amongst us requires our serious Consideration. We know not the Time when those Scales in which Mountains are weighed, may turn. The Parent of Mankind is gracious; His Care is over his smallest creatures; and a Multitude of men Escape not his Notice. And though many of them are trodden down, and despised, yet he remembers them: He seeth their Affliction, and looketh upon the spreading, increasing Exaltation of the Oppressor. He turns the Channels of Power, humbles the most haughty People, and gives Deliverance to the Oppressed, at such Periods as are consistent with his infinite Justice and Goodness. And wherever Gain is Preferred to Equity, and wrong Things publicly encouraged, to that Degree that Wickedness takes Root, and spreads wide amongst the Inhabitants of a Country, there is real Cause for Sorrow to all such whose Love to Mankind stands on a true Principle, and who wisely consider the End and Event of Things.

The prayer dictated to a friend during his last illness gives a lyrical, hymnic, Joblike expression of Woolman's spiritual experience.

O Lord my God the amazing Horrors of Darkness were gathered around me, and covered me all over, and I saw no way to go forth; I felt the misery of my Fellow Creatures separated from the divine Harmony, and it was heavier than I could bear, and I was crushed down under it. I lifted up my Hand and stretched out my Arm but there was none to help me. I looked round about and was amazed in the Depths of Misery. O Lord I remembered that thou art Omnipotent,

that I had called Thee Father, and I felt that I loved thee, and I was made quiet in thy Will, and I waited for Deliverance from Thee. Thou hadst Pity upon me when no man could help me. I saw that Meekness under Suffering was shewed to us in the most affecting example of thy Son, and thou wast teaching me to follow Him and I said, thy will, O Father be done!

Woolman's deepest expressions are profoundly personal, profoundly mystical, profoundly philosophical. The Kantian consciousness of man's twofold experience has perhaps never been more poignantly expressed; the moral law within, with the resulting lifelong struggle to achieve accord with it; and the starry heavens above with their promise of ultimate ordered harmony. Woolman's own experience is never generalized, never identified with that of others. It remains autistic; the one, the "I" overwhelmed, crushed by tremendous odds; then the Lord's will is achieved and the spirit emerges through pity into peace.

Less painful though no less clear expressions of the object of his life are found again and again throughout his works. A single example follows:

That Purity of Life which proceeds from faithfulness in following the Spirit of Truth, that State where our minds are devoted to serve God, and all our wants are bounded by his Wisdom, this Habitation has often been opened before me as a place of Retirement for the Children of the Light where they may stand separated from that which disordereth and confuseth the Affairs of society, and where we may have a Testimony of our Innocence in the Hearts of those who behold us.

What manner of man was it who lived in this pure faith? The only known picture of Woolman is the familiar drawing supposed to come from the hand of his friend and

contemporary, Robert Smith. Here we see the asthenic perhaps somewhat dysplastic countenance of a schizophrène. The face is angular, the nose pointed, the upper face long, the chin prominent, the skin of the lower face wrinkled. The hair appears dark and thick; it comes down like a cap over the forehead and extends over the collar at the back. The eye appears bright and penetrating, the brow is darkly shadowed above it. The face is singular in appearance, interesting for the peculiarity and for the expression of penetrating personality behind it, but not otherwise pleasing. Its singularity perhaps in part accounted for the alarm felt by the Friends when Woolman appeared unannounced at London Yearly Meeting on his momentous English journey. It should be remembered that this alarm gave way to a deep feeling of sympathy and approval when Woolman in the same meeting preached the powerful sermon conveying his message.

There is little in the way of personal description of Woolman's appearance and physique. We know only that he was of a slight and rather frail build; that he had several serious illnesses (tuberculosis?) that he seemed always to have had to be careful to avoid undue excess of physical exertion. He had frequently to rest "in body and mind." He was probably always extremely sensitive to external stimuli. He wrote during his English journey:

Having of late travelled often in wet weather, through narrow streets in towns and villages, where was dirtiness under foot, and the scent arising from that Filth . . . I being but weakly, have felt distress both in body and mind with that which is impure. . . . Blood and filth . . . with the Cleaning of many Stables and other Scents in the Air . . . so opposite to the clean pure Country air that I think even the Minds of people are in some degree hindered from the pure Operation of the Holy Spirit where they breathe a great deal in it. . . . Here I have felt a longing in my mind, that

people might come into Cleanness of spirit, Cleanness of person, Cleanness about their houses and Garments. . . . To hide dirt in our garments appears opposite to the real cleanliness. To wash garments, and keep them sweet, this appears cleanly. Through giving way to hiding dirt in our garments, a Spirit which would cover that which is disagreeable is strengthened.

In his last illness his native sensitiveness was doubtless accentuated:

He could bear but a low voice, nor seldom more than one or two in the room at a time, and mostly without shoes; his head at times being violently bad, he said the lifting up of a door latch, or stepping hard on the floor, was as if we had beat him with hammers, and yet throughout, his understanding was perfect; could bear to speak but little, but when he did, about his nursing or anything needful, it was so expressive, that every word seemed a sentence, and carried frequently deep instruction with it.

Woolman was simple in taste and dress. He was kindly and considerate in thought and deed. There were no pains too great when a matter of principle was involved. The best personal descriptions of Woolman are contained in the letters from England regarding his last illness and in the memorials prepared after his death. Esther Tuke of York, who nursed him wrote:

He was exceedingly afraid from the first of giving needless trouble to any; . . . I never saw one bear so much before, so I never beheld the like fortitude, patience and resignation—his hope and confidence were so strong and firmly fixed, that the greatest storms of affliction were not able to move him, or even cause him to utter an impatient word, indicating that he thought anything too hard; . . . though he appeared to us in some things singular, and the path he trod straiter than the liberty some of us have thought the truth gives, yet I say

to thee, that I cannot help thinking it was the way truth led him. Though it is not for us to endeavour to step in the same strait way, except from the like call, yet we may be thankful we are allowed more liberty, and can in a more comfortable manner enjoy the temporal blessings afforded us; and, looking at this, and at the little comfort he had, it was cause of humbling to my mind and brought an enquiry, what returns I had made, and whether I had walked answerable to what I enjoyed beyond merit; and I sometimes thought his singular and abstemious way, so striking and conspicuous, may be a means to draw divers others to the like examination; and I know nothing in this luxurious and licentious age more likely to begin a reformation than a solid consideration of this sort . . .

And if this good man's example in life and in death, should have a tendency, (as I hope it may) to draw some to consider and inspect a little closer than they have hitherto done, we should be careful how we take off the weight by blaming a singularity, which, if compared with our holy pattern, we shall find, I think, not far out of the way.

Whittier wrote of him:

Woolman's saintliness was wholly unconscious. He seems never to have thought himself any nearer to the tender heart of God than the most miserable sinner to whom his compassion extended. As he did not live, so neither did he die to himself. His prayer upon his deathbed was for others rather than for himself; its beautiful humility and simple trust were marred by no sensual imagery of crowns and harps and golden streets and personal exaltations; but tender and touching concern for suffering humanity, relieved only by the thought of the paternity of God and of his love and omnipotence, alone found utterance in ever memorable words.

The Friends in Yorkshire said of him:

He was a man endued with a large Natural Capacity, and being obedient to the manifestations of divine Grace, having in patience and humility endured many deep Baptisms, he

became thereby sanctified and fitted for the Lord's Work . . . The Spring of the Gospel Ministry often flowed through him with great Purity and Sweetness as a refreshing stream to the weary Travellers towards the City of God." . . . His Conduct . . . was seasoned with watchful circumspection and . . . attention to the Guidance of Divine Wisdom; which rendered his whole conversation uniformly edifying.

His own Monthly Meeting wrote:

His ministry was sound, very deep and penetrating, sometimes pointing out the dangerous situation which indulgence and custom lead into, frequently exhorting others, especially the youth, not to be discouraged at the difficulties which occur, but to press after purity. He often expressed an earnest engagement that pure wisdom should be attended to, which would lead into lowliness of mind and resignation to the Divine will, in which state small possessions here would be sufficient. . . . In transacting the affairs of the discipline his judgment was sound and clear, and he was very useful in treating those who had done amiss; he visited such in a private way in that plainness which truth dictates, showing great tenderness and Christian forbearance. . . . His concern for the poor and those under affliction was evident by his visits to them, whom he frequently relieved by his assistance and charity. . . . He was a loving husband, a tender father, and was very humane to every part of the creation under his care. . . . He was desirous to have his own mind and the minds of others redeemed from the pleasures and immoderate profits of this world and to fix them on those joys which fade not away; his principal care being after a life of purity, endeavouring to avoid not only the grosser pollutions, but those also which, appearing in a more refined dress, are not sufficiently guarded against by some well-disposed people. In the latter part of his life he was remarkable for the plainness and simplicity of his dress, and as much as possible avoided the use of plate, costly furniture and feasting, thereby endeavouring to become an example of temperance and self-denial, which he believed himself called unto; and he was favored with peace therein, although it carried the appearance of

great austerity in the view of some. He was very moderate in his charges in the way of business, and in desires after gain; and though a man of industry, avoided and strove much to lead others out of extreme labor and anxiety after perishable things, being desirous that the strength of our bodies might not be spent in procuring things unprofitable, and that we might use moderation and kindness to the brute animals under our care, to prize the use of them as a great favor, and by no means to abuse them; that the gifts of Providence should be thankfully received and applied to the uses they were designed for. . . . He was aged near fifty two, having been a minister upwards of thirty years, during which time he belonged to Mount Holly particular meeting which he diligently attended when at home and in health of body, and his labors of love and pious care for the prosperity of Friends in the blessed truth we hope may not be forgotten, but that his good works may be remembered to edification.

WOOLMAN, THE ASTHENIC

The asthenic with a schizothymic temperament is the second of Kretschmer's "large general bio-types which include the great mass of healthy individuals." This group contains people "with long noses, angular profiles, abnormally high middle faces, long oval and egg-shaped narrow facial contours, and figures which were either thin and slender, or wiry and lanky, or having marked muscular and bony relief." Kretschmer finds among average asthenics polite sensitive men, world hostile idealists, cold masterful natures and egoists, and the dried and emotionally lamed. It is clear that Woolman is fundamentally akin to the first but very little related to the last two of these groups. Among geniuses Kretschmer distinguishes two groups with whom Woolman has little in common: the cold calculators and the despots and fanatics; and a third group, the pure idealists and moralists, in which we would include him.

The heroes of the schizothymic temperament are made quite differently [from the pyknics with their cyclothymic natures]. Their success rests in the main on the following aspects of schizothymic characterology: their tenacity and logical systematicism, their freedom from desires, their Spartan toughness, and stoic powers of resistance against all difficulties, their coldness towards the fate of individual human beings on the one hand, and their delicate ethical sensitivity and fanatical integrity, especially the readiness of their ears to catch the sigh of the weak and unhappy, their hyperaesthetic pity, disgust and pathos in the presence of suffering and misrule caused by disregard of moral laws, and terrorising of the people, ill-using of animals, and oppressed classes of human beings, and above all their tendency to idealism. The reverse side of these advantages, is a certain love of the rigid, and doctrinaire, narrow one-sidedness and fanaticism, usually a lack of good-will, of comfortable natural humanitarianism, of understanding of concrete situations and the peculiarities of individual strangers.

With the obvious exceptions of certain disagreeable and negative elements this description holds for Woolman. He is probably related to Kretschmer's mathematicians among the schizothymes with their nervous temperaments and unique eccentricities. He has many of the characteristics of the philosophers including both the accurate, clear logicians and system builders of the Kantian type and the emotional romantic metaphysicians like Schelling, for in both of these is "a seeking after the a priori, supernatural, religio-moral postulates."

Among the writers, says Kretschmer:

Pathos and tender sentimentality, while superficially opposed to one another, have the most intimate connection from the individual-psychological point of view. The heroic and the idyllic are complementary schizothymic moods. The middle-tones—quiet, naive, 'let come what will,' and enjoyment of life—fall right outside the hyperaesthetic tempera-

ment. The heroic and the idyllic are both extremes, tense moods, between which the affect jumps, alternating from one to the other. The schizothymic soul, worn out by the noisy pathos of the heroic battle, suddenly feels the need for something diametrically opposed, for tearful tenderness, and dreamy bucolic stillness.

And so Woolman withdraws to his apple trees.

With the schizothyme there is always present the autistic contrast: here am I, and there is the world. The 'I' either occupies itself with itself and the noticing of its own emotional states, dreaming lyrical dreams, or it views itself as the antithesis of what lies all round it, as the tragic hero in a fight against gigantic odds, battling with the little distorted worm of hostility and evil, either victorious or crushed; there is no middle path such as the cyclothyme chooses.

The influences which [the geniuses] and less important schizothymes have on their time is due to the abrupt alternative nature of their emotions, and logical formulations. They are not men who see everywhere more or less goodness and badness, who find real possibilities and ways out. They see no possibilities, only hopeless impossibility, deadlock, the untenable, the harsh halt! So far and no further. They do not see ways, but only the one way, the one narrow way! Either . . . or. This way to paradise, that way to hell. . . . So they draw the one line, which looks so straight and simple, crosswise through the whole of reality.

And so, excepting the "hardness" we may conclude with Kretschmer as we contemplate the life of Woolman: "Nobility of spirit, greatness of conception, tenacity in contrary fortunes, hardness, purity and wholeness of personality, heroicism, such is the nature of great schizothymes." And we may say of him as Goethe said of the greatest schizothyme of his age: "He was like Christ, and so ought every man to be."

QUAKERISM AND PERSONALITY TYPE

In two of the most distinguished figures in the history of the Society of Friends we have found exemplified in purest form two diverse constitutional types with their appropriate temperaments. The two leaders, Penn and Woolman, had in common the major and primary spiritual aims of their Faith, and also the minor or secondary expression of these in certain personal, cultural behavior patterns. The major aims are exemplified in their lives, devoted to the service of the Christian Ideal in its personal and social aspects. The minor category includes the characteristic personality traits typical in all Quaker culture and strongly developed in both of these men. These are the expressions of a kind of simplicity and purity of thought and action which appear, as Woolman has said, "weak and foolish to that wisdom which is of the world." It seems to be a natural result of the development of these two personalities in this culture that Penn fails to show typical pyknic roughness and boisterousness while Woolman is as clearly lacking in any expression of the sinister elements often associated with the schizothymic temperament. It is in harmony with the basic principle of Quakerism "that the Divine Personality with whom our spirits have communion reveals Himself . . . with the help of the natural faculties of man."³ Penn and Woolman have shown how divergent these faculties may be in kind, and in the specific quality of effort, and yet how similar in their devotion to man's highest purpose which is doing God's will on earth.

³ Wm. C. Braithwaite, in *Spiritual Guidance in Quaker Experience*, p. 108.

SOURCES

- Amelia Mott Gummere: *The Journal and Essays of John Woolman*,
Ed. with a biographical introduction. New York, Macmillan, 1922.
643 pp.
- John W. Graham: *William Penn*. London, Headley Bros. 1917. 332 pp
- Samuel M. Janney: *The Life of William Penn*. Second ed., rev Phila-
delphia, Lippincott, Grambo 1852. 576 pp
- E. Kretschmer: *Physique and Character*. Second rev. & enl. ed. transl.
by W. J. H. Sprott, New York Harcourt, Brace. 1925. 266 pp
- Kretschmer, E. *The Psychology of Men of Genius* Tr with Intro by
R. B. Cattell. Harcourt Brace, 1931.

The Problem of Edward Byllynge

I. HIS CONNECTION WITH CORNWALL

L. Violet Holdsworth

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS

- CAMB. JNL.** "The Journal of George Fox," edited from the MSS by Norman Penney, F.S.A. 2 vols. Cambridge, England
- ESP.** "Extracts from State Papers Relating to Friends" 1674-1672. London 1913.
- SUFFERINGS.** Record of the Sufferings of Quakers in Cornwall 1655-1686 Translated and edited by Norman Penney, LL D
- SWARTHMORE MSS** Collections of letters at Friends House, London, in Reference Library
- TRIGG MINOR** "The Parochial and Family History of the Deanery of Trigg Minor in the County of Cornwall" by Sir John Maclean, F.S.A 3 vols. 1873.
- VISITATIONS.** "The Heralds' Visitations of Cornwall," comprising the Heralds' Visitations of 1530, 1573 and 1620. With additions by Lt. Col. J. V. Vivian. Exeter 1887

IV

THE PROBLEM OF EDWARD BYLLYNGE

PART I. HIS CONNECTION WITH CORNWALL

(1)

And from thence wee came to Edenborough; [writes George Fox in his *Journal* in 1657] & stayde there a while & I went to Leith & there a many officers came in & there wiffes & many was convinct: & there came Ed: Billinges wiffe with a great deale of corall in her hande & threw it before mee on ye table to see whether I woulde declare against it or noe: but I tooke noe notice of it but declared ye truth to her & shee was reacht. . . .¹

And soe after Ed: Billinges wiffe came to bee loveinge: & shee & her husband was then seperated one from ye other: & wee sent for him & hee came & ye Lords power reacht unto ym both & they Joyned togeather in it to live togeather in love & unity as man & wife.¹

Two years later, in Westminster, the recent convert was already suffering for his faith.

To the Hall [Samuel Pepys records in his *Diary* on February 7th 1659-60] "where in the Palace I saw Monk's soldiers abuse Billing and all the Quakers that were at a meeting-place there, & indeed the soldiers did use them very roughly and were to blame."²

But the clearest picture of the man is given in a letter from Robert Johnston, "formerly of O. C.'s guard," to Sec. Bennet: in 1662.³

There is one Cornett Billins a Quaker, a verie suspicious dangerous man, as the rest may be, noe man more busie stir-

¹ Camb. Jnl I. 297

² *Diary of Samuel Pepys*. (Braybrooke Edition. I. 19)

³ E S P. p. 156.

ring up & downe, inqwyreing after newes then he, a close suttle wittie man, he was never willing to tell me anything because we did differ about Clergie men, yet would inqwyre & here from any, he does not want a friend at court amongst ye rest. This Billins dwells beyond ye Abbey.

The above extracts convey something of the history and personality of the Edward Byllynge who is mentioned several times by Fox, Pepys, and in the official records of the seventeenth century; but his ancestry, family, native place and early life are all hidden in obscurity. Indeed his exact identity is one of the unsolved problems of Quaker history.

Norman Penney in his note on the subject ⁴ says:

Edward Byllynge (c. 1623-1686) of Westminster, brewer, touched the life of his times at varied points. The circumstances of his youth and of his residence in Scotland are not forthcoming, but in 1659 he had removed to London, where he underwent abuse and suffering with other Friends: "many were the knocks, and blows, and kicks myself and wife received" (Swarthmore MSS. V. 93:). In 1675 Byllynge and John Fenwick purchased of Lord Berkeley his moiety of the Province of New Jersey. Having suffered pecuniary loss, Byllynge asked William Penn to become trustee with Gawen Lawrie and Nicholas Lucas for the benefit of his creditors. Penn's work in this connection was a prelude to his greater work of founding the province of Pennsylvania. . . .

It is clear that there was some relationship between Edward Byllynge's family and that of Hambly, of Cornwall. A child of "Edward and Lillias Billing," born 1660, was named Loveday Billing (Cornwall Registers), and Edward Byllynge's "only heir and surviving child" was Gracia.⁵

When I was investigating Loveday Hambly's ancestry before writing *A Quaker Saint of Cornwall*, I discovered that her maiden name was Billing, and that she and her

⁴ Camb. Jnl. I. 297.

⁵ Camb. Jnl. I. 453.

unmarried sister Grace, who were both convinced by George Fox in Launceston Gaol, were members of an old Cornish family, the Billings of Hengar.

The question of how they came to be connected with the "Edward Billing" whom George Fox mentions, and says he convinced and reconciled to his wife in Scotland in 1657, was often in my mind; but I could get no further light upon it then. I was obliged to treat it in a note, recapitulating the known facts and adding: "This Billing-Byllinge Connection is an obscure point needing further elucidation."

In April, 1936, nine years after that note was written, I received a letter from Albert Cook Myers saying:

William Penn made his entry into American Colonisation through the difference between Edward Byllynge and John Fenwick. In my note on E. B. I should like to mention his parentage etc. Will you kindly inform me if you know this?

From a study of the Billing and other pedigrees in Maclean's *Deanery of Trigg Minor* along with the inclosed pedigree of E. B. I incline to the belief that E. B. came from the Billings of Hengar. Alexander Parker in a letter of 6mo. 7 1659 to George Fox writes: "I have mentioned my going down into Cornwall to E. Billing if he find anything upon him to goe along with me."

The pedigree enclosed was as follows:

EDWARD BYLLYNGE=Lillias
(c. 1623-1686-7) (She may be Scotch)

Quaker brewer, of Westminster, used
the 3 stags heads of the Billings
of Hengar on his seal

Loveday Billing
b. 8mo 18 1660
London
d. Oct. 5. 1688

Gracia Billing=Benjamin
living Sept. 12, Bartlett
1728 d. before
Sept. 16. 1691.

Being then fully occupied with work on my *Day-Book of Counsel and Comfort from the Epistles of George Fox*, I was unable to go deeply into this subject at that time. Then, early in this year, 1937, it occurred to me that this would be a most suitable subject to investigate further. If only I could find the answer to this old puzzle, and could discover how the man "through whom William Penn made his entry into American Colonization" came to be connected with the Cornish family of the Billings of Hengar, this was just the point for a contributor, living in Cornwall, to try to clear up in the volume honoring Rufus M. Jones, the Quaker historian of Philadelphia.

Diving back into the records again, with this in mind, and turning up the pedigree of the Billings of Hengar, in Vivian's *Visitations*, I made a, to me, thrilling discovery. Loveday Hambly's parents, Reginald and Elizabeth (Connock) Billing, had among their numerous children another daughter whose name was Philadelphia. She was older than Loveday and Grace, having been born in 1598, and was married in 1616 to Christopher Wortevale of Wortevale⁶ in Cornwall. I mentioned this marriage in *A Quaker Saint of Cornwall* but latterly I fear I had forgotten the existence of Philadelphia Billing. Now, seeing that we know there was enough connection between the Westminster brewer, Edward Byllnge, to make him name his own two daughters Loveday and Grace after the two sisters in a preceding generation who bore those same two uncommon names, is it utterly beyond the bounds of possibility that the name of yet a third daughter of Hengar might have been commemorated in another way? Is it not just conceivable that when Penn was engaged in disentangling Byllnge's financial affairs they might have dis-

⁶ Philadelphia Billing had a maternal Aunt, Philadelphia Connock after whom she was presumably named, and also a daughter, Philadelphia Wortevale, born in 1619.

cussed suitable names to be given to new townships in America? That Byllynge might have recalled the Christian name familiar in his family⁷ and suggested it as a suitable name for the ideal City of Brotherly Love to be founded overseas? If this were so, and if this point could be established, then it is not to the famous Founder but to this long dead and forgotten woman, Philadelphia Billing of Cornwall, that the great city owes its name.

At this point I always seem to see my father, Thomas Hodgkin, shaking his head and saying with a smile:

"A very pretty fancy! But remember, it is thy privilege in this book to write in the company of historians. Thou must not let thy imagination run away with thee. Thou must give historical proof."

This is the task I have set myself for the next few months, and this is the point I propose to deal with in my paper. As I write these first paragraphs, though the lines between Edward Byllynge of Westminster and the Billings of Hengar in Cornwall do seem to be converging, I cannot honestly say that they have yet met.

Of course it is only the problem of the connection between these two that I hope to solve. If my further daring hypothesis as to the naming of Philadelphia may remain as even the faintest of faint possibilities I shall be amply satisfied.

Written at Bareppa near Falmouth, Cornwall.

April, 1937.

(2)

"Hopeless to find, yet loath to leave unsought."

Comedy of Errors. I. 1.

Before grappling with the main subject there are one or two side-issues to be cleared up. Though it is not yet

⁷ The Wortevales of Worthevale at the Heralds' Visitation of 1620 traced their pedigree back for twelve generations in unbroken descent.

clear who Edward Byllynge of Westminster was, there are several other people of the same name, who he certainly was not. He was not the Edward Bealin, mentioned in the *Sufferings of Friends in Cornwall* in 1670 as having had taken from him by the Constables of Penryn "4 Slaggess worth 15s for a fine of 5/ imposed upon him."⁸ And again, in the same *Sufferings* in 1685, the same

Edward Bealinge off ye townde off penryn ffor refuseinge to ffinde a halfe armes as aforesd had taken ffrom him by Tho: peter Will Reade & Michael pearce Constables off ye aforesd townde off Penryn 80½ lbs weight of steele & 18 pewter plates: In all worth 4 pounds.⁹

Norman Penney, whom I consulted on the subject in 1926, was convinced that the wealthy brewer of Westminster, who in 1670 bought a tract of land in America from Lord Berkeley for £1000, must have been a different person from this obscure Friend of Penryn who was, in the same year, fined for not paying the small sum of five shillings. I confess that until lately I cherished a hope that after all they might have been the same person; and that through this long-ago member of our Monthly Meeting the connection of Falmouth with the settlement in America was more direct than now seems probable. Francis J. Stephens, our Cornish antiquary, himself of Quaker descent, wrote to me lately as follows in answer to a question about these Cornish Bealings:

The name Bealing is very familiar to me . . . I have always supposed that, broken in the Civil War, they drifted down and down and joined Quakers. Anyhow two of them settled at Falmouth, and one of John Stephens' sons married Nicholas Jose's daughter, Mary, (sister to Honor Jose who

⁸ *Sufferings*. p. 71.

⁹ *Ibid.* p. 133

married John Tregelles). One of their sons, I think, married Alice Bealing who had a brother Edward who "kept a pewterer's shop at Penryn." About this Alice, tradition has handed down a good few things. She seems to have been a tartar in her way, for on one occasion when the Constables were in the shop to take away the owner's best things to pay his fines she ran to the back and seized a great iron "scew" (a sort of pail) full of pigs' meat and carried it to the shop and "sleashed it" at the bailiffs. She then had to take cover at her father's farm at Harcourt where she lay hidden for some weeks.

You will find a note to this effect in the papers of Kea Monthly Meeting (Come-to-Good) if they have not been destroyed, as I rather fear. . . . Nevertheless Alice Stephens was a sort of respected member, constantly chosen as a representative to other meetings. Her name occurs over and over again in the early minutes of Falmouth Monthly Meetings. Unfortunately we know very little of her brother Edward. Tradition says that he was in partnership with John Tregelles, Honor's husband, which is very likely, but it does not account for a rumpus between them and a strict overhauling of accounts. John Stephens, his connection by marriage, took sides against John Tregelles but this was not unusual, as the country Friends were always at loggerheads with the town Friends.

A reference to the early Monthly Meeting Minute Book of Cornwall, now in safe keeping at Friends House in London, proves conclusively, however, that this was an altogether different Edward Bealing. For he and his relatives of the same name, senior and junior to him, continued to sign Monthly Meeting Minutes in the West for many years after Edward Byllynge, the Westminster Friend, had died "of a Phthisie," in 1686-7 as the London Registers show. Moreover, it is recorded in the *Sufferings* that as late as 1702 "Edward Bealing of Penryn was taken up and imprisoned for holding an open-air meeting in Pydar St., Penryn, with other friends."

When I mention that in the course of this inquiry I have already come upon traces of certainly six, and possibly seven different Edward Bealings, or Billings, or Byllynges, who all lived about this time, my relief may be imagined at finding that none of these three obscure West Country Friends can be the man we are seeking. Why so many different people should have been given the same Christian name, if there were no connection between them, is another of the problems with which the subject abounds. For the sake of cleanness in this paper I have followed Edward Byllynge's autograph signature in the spelling of his own name; that of Billing, given in the "*Visitations of Cornwall*," for the Billings¹⁰ of Hengar; and that of the *Sufferings* for these Bealings or Bealins of Penryn. In view of what is to follow, it is worth noting that Pepys, (who may have been in a position to know the facts that are as yet hidden from us), invariably spells the London Friend's name as if he were a member of the Cornish family, *i.e.*, Billing.¹¹

But although the humble Bealings of Penryn are clearly "out of the picture," that gives only a negative help to the main problem: What was the connection between Edward Byllynge of Westminster and the Billings of Hengar in Cornwall that gave the former a right to use the three stags' heads, the crest of the latter, on his seal?

The pedigree of the Cornish family gives no help on this matter. It almost seems to make the problem more

¹⁰ In the Early Church Registers of St. Tudy Billinge is spelt thus, with a final 'e' before 1616. After that date the 'e' is dropped.

¹¹ Sir John Maclean in his *History of the Deanery of Trigg Minor* states that "The family is of Norman descent. The name is still found in France. It is of great antiquity in Cornwall under the following and other forms: Byllun, Billon, Billion, Bylloun, Bullen, Byllyng and Billing. There are records of Billings in Cornwall from the 13th Century onwards."

Among the names of a jury in Puritanical days occurs the name "Weep-Not Billing" of Lewes in Sussex.

obscure. At the time of the Heralds' Visitation of 1620, the head of the family was Loveday Hambly's father, Richard Billing, "Escheator and Feodarie of Charles, Prince of Wales." That is to say, he was the holder of a high feudal office in the Duchy of Cornwall, the appanage of the heir of the Crown. His wife was Elizabeth Connock,¹² daughter of John Connock¹³ of Treworgie in the neighboring parish of St. Cleer. This couple, Richard and Elizabeth Billing, had, as has been said, a large family of eight children: five daughters, of whom Philadelphia, Grace and Loveday have been already mentioned, and also two sons. The elder of these, Edward, was aged twenty-two in 1620, and might well have been the father of the subject of this essay, had he not died and been buried at St. Tudy in 1621 according to the Church Registers in that place. Whereas, from our Quaker record already quoted, that our Edward Byllynge "died of a Phthisie, aged 63, on 16, 11, 1686-7," it seems clear that he could not have been born earlier than 1623. Therefore, if the St. Tudy Register is correct, our man could not have

¹² Having mentioned the Connock Family I should like to take this opportunity to correct my note on this Elizabeth's sister, Loveday Connock, Lady Vyvyan, on p. 218 of *A Quaker Saint of Cornwall*. She was not the wife (as there stated) but the mother of Sir Richard Vyvyan of Trelowarren. Her husband was Sir Francis Vyvyan. Their marriage took place in 1609 or 1610. Therefore my conjecture that my heroine, Loveday Billing (afterwards Hambly) might have been named Loveday because she had been born at her aunt's home at Trelowarren is incorrect, as Loveday Connock's marriage to Sir Francis Vyvyan had not then taken place. Why Loveday Billing's baptism is not entered in the church register at St. Tudy among those of her sisters is still unexplained.

I owe this correction about Loveday Connock, Lady Vyvyan, to Sir Courtenay Vyvyan, Bt., C.B., of Trelowarren, who possesses portraits in oil of her and of her husband and son. It is an unusual pleasure in writing Quaker history to know what some of their relations actually looked like.

¹³ Loveday Connock, Lady Vyvyan, and Elizabeth Connock, who married Reginald Billing of Hengar, were both daughters of John Connock of Treworgie. Another daughter of his, Philadelphia Connock, married—Edward Carr of London. Could Edward Billing of Hengar have been named after him?

been even the illegitimate son of the young Edward Billing of Cornwall who died in 1621. This had occurred to me as a possible solution of the mystery, and of his omission from the family tree. Who then was he? What made him call his two daughters Loveday and Grace, both of them names borne by living Billings of Hengar, and by what right did he use the seal bearing the three stags' heads?

(Written at various times and places.)

(3)

Summer, 1937.

This Billing problem is always at the back of my mind, but while I am seeing my *Day-Book* through the press I dare not let myself get engrossed in it. I have therefore been doing a little research by proxy, and have had the help of two professional antiquarians in this enquiry.

Mr. Reginald Glencross, of the Society of Genealogists, after hunting through many wills in the Court of Canterbury for me, came upon one of Thomas Billing¹⁴ of Sutton under Brailes, Co. Gloucester, dated 25 Oct. 27 Car. II. 1675. In this, after various other legacies, the Testator bequeaths

To the younger daughter of my brother Edward, Love-dee Billing my Lease in Sutton afsd and rest of goods & she to be extrix. To my brother Francis his son and daur 40/ a piece.

This Will was proved "19th November 1675 by Edward Billing, father and guardian of Lovedee, alias Loveday B.

¹⁴ The Thomas Billing mentioned in Besse's *Sufferings* (I. 355) who was imprisoned for one month in Lincoln Castle for absence from the National Worship, in April 1679, must be a different person, as this will was proved in 1675.

extrix. & to be administered by him during her minority. Sd E.B. sworn P.A.B. 149 ut supra." (It seems strange, if this were Edward Byllynge the Quaker, that he should have been willing to swear in a Court of Law.)

In the London Register of Births at Friends House there is an entry "1660. VIII. 18. Loveday Billing dau. of Edward and Lillias Billing." This Loveday therefore would still be a minor in 1675 if she were the one named in Thomas Billing's will. In view of this fact and also of her being referred to as "younger daughter" (implying only two daughters) and her father's name being Edward, it seems reasonable to conclude that this will does refer to her.

From the order in which the daughters' names were given, both in Norman Penney's note and in A. C. Myers' pedigree, I had hitherto supposed Loveday to be the elder of the two. Now, however, seeing that Gracia's name does not appear at all in our birth registers (which are fairly complete after 1660) this will may be right in describing Loveday as the younger. Anyhow Gracia outlived Loveday by at least forty years, as she was still alive in 1728.

It is only from this register of Loveday Billing's birth that we know her mother's Christian name. Lillias is, in all probability, the "Mrs Billing" of Fox's Journal, whom he met and reconciled to her husband in Scotland in 1657. Lillias is a well-known Scottish form of the name. The couple may therefore have met and married in the North while the bridegroom was serving under Monk. Their marriage must have taken place some little while before 1657, to allow time enough for the quarrel and separation before George Fox's visit. It seems hopeless to try to find further particulars about it without any clue as to where and when the marriage took place.¹⁵ Any-

¹⁵ The "Breviate" of the *Journal* states that Fox met Byllinge and others at the town of "Burfort" in Scotland. *Camb. Jnl.* 1. 453.

how the date of their reconciliation, as given by Fox, would fit in well with the birth of two daughters, one in 1658-9 and one in 1660.

The reason of Edward Byllyng's leaving Scotland may well have been Monk's Purge in the autumn of 1657 when he turned out of his army all soldiers and officers¹⁶ suspected of Quaker leanings, as mentioned in the following testimony. Though E.B.'s name is not given, he may well be included in the "many others which were tender," as stated in the postscript. This MS letter contains interesting information about the use of the name Quaker at this early date, so I print it entire.

A testimony of some of ye souldyers yt were turned out of ye army whoe owned ymselves to be quakers. 1657.¹⁷

In obedience to an order given forth under the hande of Jere. Smith by order from ye L. Genll Monck, bearing date the 14th of October 1657 wherein is written I desire yu also to certifie under yr hands wat Quakers ether officers or souldiers ye have in yr Troope. In answer their unto, we whose names are here under written beinge officers and souldiers in Capt Wm Bradford & Capt Watkinson their Troopes in Coll: Robt Kilburne his Regte of horse, doe certifie to all whom these may any way, or in anywise concerne, that ye name of Quakers as it is by ye world given in much scorne and derision to ye Children of ye Ld who beleive in ye light Xt Jesus and walke in ye same, wee dare not owne, But quakinge and tremblinge according to what the scriptures declares of wee doe owne, and wat they doe declare of by the power & workinge of Jesus Xt in our measures we witness fulfilled in us, And if we should deny this before men we might rightly feare yt hee yt hath begun

¹⁶ It is interesting that Pepys expressly mentions (in the passage of the *Diary* for February 7th 1659-60 already quoted) that it was Monk's soldiers whom he saw "abusing Billing and all the Quakers." There may have been old grudges to pay off.

¹⁷ Swarthmore MSS. Vol. IV. No. 237.

this good work in us might deny us before his father which is in heaven, accordinge to yt scripture he yt denyes me before men him will I deny before my fathr which is in heaven. And to the truth here of as by Xt Jesus it is revailed in us, in ye pure feare, dread & power of ye eternall livinge God who made heaven & earth & knowes ye secrets of all harts are we made willinge to give this testimonie under our hands the 20th day of ye 8 month cauled October in ye yeare 1657.

Mathew ffoster
Willm Millington
ffrancis Booth

Tho. Watkinson
Tho Parish Chaplain to ye Maye
Jonas Langdall
ffrancis Rowntre
John Simpson

All these were turned out
of ye Army by Moncke
with many others wch were
tender (in ye army) of God's truth.

My other helper, Mr. William Le Hardy's,¹⁸ researches have supplied a few more facts which may, or may not, have a bearing on our particular problem.

He finds that the Will of an Edward Billinge, Citizen and Merchant Taylor of London was proved on 24 August, 1636, but none of the relatives mentioned in it seem to connect with the subject of this inquiry. His wife and sole executrix was named Jane Billinge, there was a brother William Billinge, and a kinsman Richard Billinge, to whom "a debt of 20s which he owes me is cancelled." In view of these discrepancies I think that this Merchant Taylor Edward Billinge may also be cancelled, though with rather less certainty than the Bealings of Penryn. Mr. Le Hardy wrote to me:

The main object of your enquiry seems to be in regard to Edward Billing's birth and parentage. With that in view I decided that I would gamble on the fact that as he was a

¹⁸ Hardy and Reckitt, Record Agents, Lincoln's Inn. London.

brewer in Westminster he might have been apprenticed to the Brewer's Company, which by charter had control over all the Brewers not only within the City but over all who carried on this trade within four miles of the Guildhall.

If Edward Billing died in 1686 aged 63, he must have been born in 1623. It was usual for apprentices to be bound at the age of 14, but sometimes they were bound as young as 12, and they could apparently be bound at any age above 14. Unfortunately there is no list of apprentices to the Brewers Company before the beginning of the 18th Century. Prior to this they were enrolled in Minute Books. These are not indexed in any way until the year 1659. Consequently it was necessary for me to read through the minutes, page by page, and unluckily I decided to commence at the earliest possible date for the apprenticeship of Edward Billing, when he would have been about twelve. Having spent most of the day at this somewhat laborious task, I was about to give up in despair when I discovered the following entry in the Records of the Worshipful Company of Brewere, London: Court Minute Book. A Court of Assistants held the 6th day of February, 1650-1.

Edward Billing the sonne of Jasper Billinge, late of the parish of Saint Buttolphes without Bishopsgate, London, Clarke, deceased, doth putt himself apprentice unto John Greate, citizen and brewer of London for the terme of seven yeares from the date a foresaid.

In a later letter Mr. Hardy says:

A visit to the Friends House revealed the fact that in their copy of the burial entry Edward Billing is described as being of the parish of "Butophes Aldgate" whereas the original copy of the entry at Somerset House, which I inspected, gave his residence as Botophes Aldersgate. As you are probably aware there was a parish of St Botolph Aldgate and another at St Botholphs Aldersgate. Furthermore the entry I found in the Brewers' Company's Records gave Edward's father's residence at St. Botolphs Bishopsgate which was yet another parish. I have examined the records at St Botolphs Bishopsgate and send you the references to the Billing family which

are disappointing. . . . There is as you will see no record of a baptism of an Edward Billing.

I also examined all the records at the Guildhall, London, which I thought could possibly assist. The fact that the three St Botolph parishes were either in, or closely adjoining, the city encouraged me to think that here we might find something. I was disappointed to find nothing of significance.

In view of the name of the father, and also the fact that when George Fox met our E.B. in Scotland in 1657 he was then a "Cornett" in Monk's army, and is described later, with John Fenwick, as "an old Cromwellian soldier," I do not myself believe that he can have been apprenticed to a Brewer for seven years in 1650, or that this last entry refers to him. At any rate I am not sufficiently sanguine about it to pursue the search through all these different parish registers. But as this entry does put on record the existence of another E.B. (if he were not our man) it is worth mentioning.¹⁹ Why all these different, widely separated Billings should have borne the same Christian name is, as I said before, one of the many perplexing points of this perplexing subject.

(4)

Reference Library, Friends House, London, 16 September, 1937.

"Voyager c'est mieux qu'arriver."

At last, and only now, I am free from other work and able to come up to London on purpose to try to get more light on this problem. I find it more enthralling than any cross-word or mystery story.

Lately I have been advised to attack it from a different angle altogether: instead of trying to find out how E.B.

¹⁹ As is also the existence of yet another apparently irrelevant one: Edward Billing of Rockingham, Northamptonshire, yeoman, aged 60 in 1633, discovered by Mr. Le Hardy, (24 September, 1937) since the above was written.

came to be entitled to use the Hengar crest, to work back from the Seal itself to its possible owner, *i.e.*, to work not from the man to the Seal, but back through the Seal to the history of the man.

So now I have started from the Three Stags' Heads. Following their track they have led me down to the College of Arms in the City of London. There, in two interviews, I have put the problem of Edward Byllynge's ancestry before Mr. Archibald Russell, who holds the office of "Lancaster Herald," and have been fortunate enough to enlist his sympathetic interest in this inquiry. Besides having the records in the Heralds' College studied, he has given me much helpful advice. Mr. Russell, at our second interview, declared that "there does seem to be something here that needs to be cleared up." If such an expert as Lancaster Herald himself is of this opinion, it is no wonder that our Quaker historians have been puzzled; and that, as Norman Penney wrote with reason (in his note in the *Cambridge Journal*), the facts about E.B.'s antecedents are "not forthcoming."

During my visit, Mr. Russell sent for the original Pedigree Book of the *Heralds' Visitation of 1620*. This is one of the largest folios I have ever seen, with all the entries in manuscript. Here he showed me the pedigree of the Billings of Hengar, and pointing to the name of Edward Billing, son of Richard Billing and Elizabeth Connock, aged twenty-two at the time of this visitation in 1620, seemed at first to think that he was the man, or the father of the man I wanted.

"But," I exclaimed, "this is no use, because that young man was buried at St. Tudy a year later."

"There is no record of his death here," Mr. Russell replied.

"You will find it in Vivian's printed *Visitations*," I per-

sisted. So that book too was sent for; and there, sure enough, after the name of this Edward Billing, Philadelphia and Loveday's brother, was the other entry that has so often dashed my hopes: "Buried St. Tudy, 1621."

It was then that Mr. Russell expressed the opinion recorded above that "evidently there is something here to be cleared up." He went on to explain that this original MS Pedigree was carefully gone through, verified and completed in 1870. Therefore if the death of *an* Edward Billing at St. Tudy in 1621 is established by the burial registers of that church, it looks as if the careful revisers of this pedigree were not sufficiently certain of his identity with the elder son of Richard and Elizabeth (Connock) Billing to add the information after his name here, as they would have done had the matter been beyond dispute.

He said:

"We may assume from Vivian that *an* Edward Billing died and was buried at St. Tudy in 1621. The question remains whether it was *this* Edward Billing, who was aged twenty-two in 1620. If it were, it is, to say the least, curious that the fact was not recorded here when our book was revised."

Mr. Russell went on (I am using notes of his words kindly taken down for me by a friend at this interview):

"The following seems to me to be a *possible* explanation of the known facts; but of course proof is needed:

"It is possible that this E.B. married in, let us say, 1618 or 1619 . . ."

—"But if so would not that fact have been entered in the *Visitation* of 1620?" L.V.H. enquired.

"Not necessarily," Mr. Russell replied. "He might have married against his parents' wishes and been disinherited——"

"If so," continued Mr. Russell, "he could have had a son, named Edward Billing, who died in infancy and was buried at St. Tudy (as the Register shows) in 1621. He might also have had a second son, born elsewhere, in 1623, who, as the custom was in those days, bore the same name as the deceased child. This third E.B. of the Hengar family, if born in 1623, might quite well have been the E.B. of Fox and Pepys, who died in 1686-7 as your Quaker records shew." He would have been the nephew of Loveday and Grace Billing and might naturally have named his own two daughters after them."

On hearing this, I produced the will, mentioned above, found for me by Mr. Glencross, of Thomas Billing of Sutton in Gloucestershire. In view of (1) the ²⁰ unusual Christian names attached to the same surname and (2) that Loveday Billing is called "younger daughter" (implying only two daughters) and (3) that she is called a minor at this time, which fits in with the date of her birth recorded at Friends House, Mr. Russell feels fairly sure that this will does refer to this family. He therefore suggests, *conjecturally*, the following pedigree to which he appended a note: "There seems to be little doubt on the evidence available that Edward Billing belonged to the Cornish family."

Bareppa, 24 September, 1937.


Since coming home, and now that I am able to refer to my own books again, I have found one fact that seems to tell against this theory and two others that make it seem possible. To take the damaging evidence first:

²⁰ In a younger branch of the Billing family in Cornwall, I find, that a little later there was a third pair of Grace and Loveday Billing sisters, in the generation between the two pairs we are concerned with; i.e. Grace and Loveday Billing of Great Lauke, born; Grace 1630 & Loveday 1636. This last Loveday however would not be a minor in 1675. There is no Edward recorded in this younger branch of the family. (October 1937.)

SUGGESTED PEDIGREE

Richard Billing = Elizabeth Connock

of Hengar
buried at St
Tudy 1624



²¹ In the Quaker Register of Burials belonging to Peel M. M. at Friends House is an entry that on the 5th of and month 1686 Dorothy Billing, of the Parish of St. Sepulchre's "died of age." It is just possible that this old lady might have been the wife of Edward Billing (1) and the mother of our man Edward Byllinge (11), but I have not been able to pursue this clue.

In my own printed copy of Vivian's *Visitation of 1620* I find not only the burial entry against Edward Billing's name, but also that his younger brother John is described as "only son and heir" of their father Reginald Billing—who died in 1624. This fact however, like the death of Edward, is in Roman type, *i.e.*, it has been added later. The original entries of the 1620 Visitation are printed in italics.

Now for the two slight confirmations:

Of this son, John Billing, Maclean says:

he adhered to the royal cause during the rebellion, and was at Truro at the disbanding of the horse there, and consequently was allowed to compound for his estate.

Might not these Hengar Billings, who were devoted Royalists, quite well have disdained later on to own kinship with "Cornett Billing" an officer under Cromwell and Monk? ²²

The other fact, though admittedly slight, which also seems to me to offer some corroboration is the resemblance between the handwriting in Loveday Hambly's one extant autograph letter, preserved at Friends House, and that of Edward Byllynge in the very interesting facsimile of his signature reproduced in the *Pennsylvania Magazine* for January, 1937. Both show the same distinctly educated and literary script, quite different from the usual Quaker handwritings of this period. The "E.B." signature of the letter preserved at The Mount, York, is in a different hand altogether, much less educated; but that signature will be discussed by John Nickalls in Part II of this *Problem*.

²² Thomas Lower's name also disappears from the Pedigree after he joined Friends. The date of his burial at St Tudy is recorded, but not his wife; Mary Fell's name; or any of their children's names, naturally, as they would not be baptised.

With that letter, I have nothing to do here; I must, however, add that in the letter in the *Pennsylvania Magazine*, referred to above, in which Edward Byllynge makes his gift of land to Friends as a thank-offering for his own deliverance from his troubles, we find the confirmation of an entry in our own Cornwall Monthly Meeting Records:

1682. A paper from Edward Billing was read in the meeting offering 10,000 acres of land in New Jersey to one hundred poor families of friends.

This offer was sent to many other places in England apparently.²³ The minute showing that it was received by Falmouth Monthly Meeting is the latest trace of E.B.'s connection with the West of England.

To return to the main subject of this paper, if the above theory, or anything resembling it, be correct, the fact that Edward Byllynge called his own two daughters after two of his maternal aunts is fully explained. All through the family tree the faithfulness of the Billing family to names borne by members of previous generations is characteristic. Explained too, is one of the first things that struck me, more than ten years ago, that George Fox made acquaintance with Edward and Lillias Billing in Scotland in 1657, very shortly after visiting Loveday Hambly in Cornwall after his release from Launceston in 1656. What more likely than that she, his recent and devoted friend and convert, should ask him to seek out her nephew, serving in the army in Scotland, on his own northern journey? She may even have known of the disagreement between husband and wife and asked G.F. to try to effect a reconciliation, as he so successfully did. This, of course, is

²³ The postscript of the letter, in Byllynge's own hand, says: "I have sent, and intend, forthwith, to send the Like paper unto perticuller Freinds in most of the Countys of England and Wales" *Pennsylvania Magazine* Vol. LXI 1. p 92.

conjecture. What is certain is that Alexander Parker, who was Fox's companion on this northern journey in 1657, writes two years later: ²⁴ "6.mo.7.1659. I have mentioned my goeing down into Cornewell to E. Billing if he find anything on him to goe along with me," implying that he was a likely man to wish to visit the West.

Above all, this theory, if it can be proved, that Edward Byllynge really was one of the Hengar Billings, establishes the fact that the man "through whom William Penn made his entry into American Colonization" possessed not only one but three near kinswomen,²⁵ who bore the unusual Christian name given later to Philadelphia.

This is as far as I can get at present, before this paper must be posted to America. I shall, however, go on searching for further confirmation on the subject, trusting that when a second volume is called for, as we must all hope it will be, in five years time, I may have no longer mere conjectures as now, however plausible, but fully established facts to offer to our Friend in honour of his *Eightieth* Birthday.

²⁴ In the letter quoted by A. C. Myers on p 3

²⁵ Great Aunt, Aunt and Cousin

The Problem of Edward Byllynge

II. HIS WRITINGS AND THEIR EVIDENCE OF HIS INFLUENCE
ON THE FIRST CONSTITUTION OF WEST JERSEY

John L. Nickalls

V

THE PROBLEM OF EDWARD BYLLYNGE

II. HIS WRITINGS AND THEIR EVIDENCE OF HIS INFLUENCE ON THE FIRST CONSTITUTION OF WEST JERSEY

Some months ago a small collection of early Quaker letters belonging to The Mount School, York, was kindly lent to The Library at Friends House, London, for examination. Among them is an undated letter headed "for George Fox the Younger" and signed "E.B.," the whole transcribed in the handwriting of Thomas Ellwood. The evidence points to Edward Byllinge being the author.

Violet Holdsworth has dealt with Edward Byllinge's Cornish ancestry and found a possible origin for the name of the city of Philadelphia among his kin. It was during one of her visits in this connection to The Library at Friends House that she suggested to me that this recently discovered letter was sufficiently interesting to make it a suitable starting point for a paper in this volume. This course commended itself at once for not only did it offer a promising and compassable theme, but it added to the privilege of being a contributor here the pleasure of sharing a subject with the writer of the previous paper. I shall follow the spelling used in Edward Byllinge's extant signatures though many references use "Billing." Since his letters are rare, (I know of only two or three others), material about him scanty, and the letter itself autobiographical, it is here printed in full. Moreover the investigation of its date and authorship has revealed a number of facts about Byllinge which considerably in-

crease his interest for us and may help to define his features in the rather obscure niche he occupies in the hall of American history. The letter is as follows:

For George Fox. younger.

Dear Lamb: In the strength of our God I have passed through a troop, and leaped over a wall. Yesterday the Lord made good way for my passing in a garment of sackcloth and ashes on my head before them called justices. In the morning I sent for Jn: Dixon's cloake, feeling that I might be called that day, as soon as the Goaler gave me notice forthwith to come downe I immediately put on the sackcloth garment, one of my fellows (Law. Aplin) (who till then knew nothing nor none in the prison) put a pretty big heap of ashes on my head, and I put a linnen cap over them to keep them from falling downe, and my hat on the top of al, being assured that they would put it off when I came to the barr; being brought to the barr, they bid us be uncovered, I not obeying them the officer immediately pul'd off my hat; then I unloosed the lipped of my sackcloth garment, which was tucked up about my middle within a girdle, that being done, I let fal the cloke, and with my own hand pul'd off the linnen cap from off my head: the bench being struck and the people confounded, them called Justices paused a little and bad the Gaoler take us away and set us by till anon or soe; so by we were set, even as it were to the desire of my heart, for as I judge the place where he sat me, was about five foot higher then the people; where for an hour or more I stood in the power of God the Lord, for the most part wholly silent, facing sometimes toward the court, sometimes to the full view of the hal, sometimes toward the Parliament: house, but for the most part towards Whitehal. I was tempted by several great ones of my acquaintance to have drawn me into words, but the Lord kept me out of them and over them, and made me terrible to them al some few raged but many were smitten and many there were that did behould me of most if not of all sorts, and of several nations as I perceived. Some of the very basest sort spit upon me, and a whorish woman or two struck me in the face.

Then to the bar the Goaler was commanded to bring us a second time, being brought, they called Justices began to impart for what we were brought thither, viz to swear; then the Lord opened my mouth and there was good audience given: I told them because of oaths this verie land mourns and the judgements of the Lord was was ready to be poured upon it as a mighty floud; yea it wil be swift as lightning, and the superstitious and profane therein shal not escape his fiery wrath, then shal they find that they have and now doe oppress the innocent; then they began to say as it were sorowfully, that they must tender me the oath; one of them said the oaths of Alegiance and supremacy, I tould them I thought that was altogether without their sphear, for I said I did believe that R. Everard had done that in that kind already, which, by the law of the Nation was not answerable; then Everard positively said, that we were committed for the oath of Alegiance only, then I produced a copie of our mittimus to which was his hand; then he put it to me if I would take my oath if that were a true copie, and so would have shifted there, but I knock'd him down in saying in the pain of £100 I would affirm it to be a true copie, then he was ashamed and confounded and not one man took his part.

Then I desired that his commitment might be made void, because it was not according to Law; they waved that, and said I might to take my course against him, yea they spoke it as if they desired it; then they began to offer me and the rest of friends the oath of Alegiance; I declared to them with a loud voice, how that we had not sworn to, for, nor against any since we were a people; making a ful and ample rehearsal of the former governments, everyone of them in their order, how they had imprisoned us to death for not swearing and the like, & that we did not of dislike or approbation to this or that or the other government, but for a pure conscience sake, and in obedience to the command of Christ Jesus who said swear not at al; and this we have done as a people for conscience sake the Lord knows. And as for myself I could say very much in that matter for said I, when it was debated in the parliament house whether I should have a command in the army, yea or nay, and the house were even divided thereupon once or twice, and afterwards it was moved and dis-

cussed again and again, the result of the whole was, if I would abjure Charles Stuart, I should have a considerable command in the armie. Therefore its purely for good conscience and not in the heart least out of designe, stubbornness or aversion to this that or the other government.

This was quite through and beyond them, insomuch that they said, I spake rationally, seasonably, soberly and modestly, and I had said as much [as] could be said: but they said there was an act of James, 3d. [year] so they read it and to every paragraph I spake as it was read, largely, letting them see that the Statute was made for the discovery of Papists upon ye gun-powder treason: I put it to them to judge if it were not, and they said yes . . . but its still for the discover of Papists, and that intentionally it coould not be made for us because wee were not then a People. And I said I did referr myself to that of God in them, whether they did believe I was or we are Papists or popishly affected, they with one consent, except Everard, said they did believe in their consciences we are not; then I asked if they did think we had any hand in the late insurrection, they said they did not think we had, then said I yee ought to stay till ye have a Statute in parliamt. made against us if ye rightly consider the thing for said I ye have here confessed, that ye do believe that wee are not Papists, or popishly affected, nor plotters nor insurrectors, but that we doe refuse to swear for conscience sake; and I shall prove that it is according to the law of God, and there is a Maxim in your law, that the people are not obliged to obey any law contrary to the law of God. They were wholly silent and struck to the heart, yea and loved me and said again, I had spoke modestly, and as much as a man could say; though this is but a breviat of what I did say.

Then I desired them to hear me with patience explain the whole matter, why for conscience sake we could not swear; which [I] fully opened with an audible voice so that its like most of the people might hear me, as wel as those called Justices, ye Lord was mightly with me in that matter, and the power reached to its own in very many that heard, but they said, now I was brought before them, they were bound to offer the oath to me, and so they asked us severally if we would take the oath of Alegiance, we refused severally, then the

living God opened my mouth, and I exhorted them al immediately to repentance for the day of the Lord cometh swift as lightning; they drunk in my words, some of them were astonished I saw and felt. And as ye Gaoler was taking me and the rest of friends from the bar to Gaole, (for so was his order) I spake again, not I but the Lord; they of the bench stood up, and listened as long as they could hear me.

The management of the whole matter I can truly say was of the Lord, and for the honour of his pretious truth, which they in authority saw was dearer to me then my life, or outward estate, for they told me it would reach that, my answer to that was largely sufficient and seemed to be the very truth of my heart to them. There were several that belong to Whitehall there.

Dear Lamb, I had much comfort and strength in thy lines thou sents mee last, for the enemie strove, but the power was terrible and pleasaunt; I truly say unto thee thy lines were a help to my feeble knees.

E: B:

The reference to the buildings, Parliament and Whitehall, within sight from the hall where he is before the judges makes it clear that the writer stood in Westminster Hall, where courts of justice then sat. The date is after the Restoration, for he cites in his defence a refusal to abjure Charles Stuart. "The late insurrection" is the Fifth Monarchy rising of January, 1661. But it cannot be as late as July that year for, by his defence, there is as yet no act against Quakers. Neither Joseph Besse nor the MS. volumes registering sufferings make any particular mention of a trial in Westminster Hall at this time. We therefore conclude the writer was one of those hundreds of Friends in and about London who were arrested, imprisoned and offered the Oath of Allegiance both before and after the Fifth Monarchy rising. The letter is that of a man experienced enough to have acquaintances among those in authority, no stranger to his present sur-

roundings, resolute on his chosen course but not unconscious of inner weakness. He expresses himself boldly in defence and clearly in exposition. He believes, too, in the coming of swift and terrible vengeance from the Lord upon the wicked. Is Edward Byllynge the author? A piecing together of the evidence about him will help to answer the question.

Edward Byllynge first appears in Quaker history in 1657 during George Fox's visit to Scotland. At that time this young Cornishman, some thirty-four years of age, was a cornet, or in the modern term, second lieutenant, commanding a troop in one of General Monk's cavalry regiments, then stationed at Leith.¹ He is living estranged from his wife Lillias, but when she meets and hears George Fox she is reached by his words. Before long her husband is sent for; he too is convinced and they are reconciled.

Many newly convinced Friends were turned out of Colonel Robert Lilborne's regiment of horse by an order of General Monk, dated 14th October, 1657, the day after Fox's interview with the council in Edinburgh. Whether or not Byllynge was one of these, and the later development of his convictions suggests he was, he certainly left the army about this time. He must have seen some considerable length of service, for he implies, in a tract he wrote the next year, that he was at the battle of Dunbar, 1650.² Was he one of those who, after the battle, crowded to hear Quartermaster James Nayler preach, or if he heard him did he, like James Wilson, get away uneasily lest he should be changed by Nayler's words?³ At all events there was no turning back now; there would be regrets at the closing of a chapter, as well as rejoicing. He knew Monk and of course many of his officers, and was able a year or

¹ F. G. Jul. (Camb.) I. 297. Another account says Burfort.

² *Word of Reproof*, 1659, p. 10.

³ *Memoirs of James Gough*, pp. 55-57.

two later to turn this to good account on behalf of suffering Friends, among whom were himself and his wife.

It is not long before we hear of him in London. He became a brewer and settled in Westminster in the district of Millbank,⁴ west of the Abbey, then still more or less rural in character. It was not long before he was accepted in the counsels of leading Friends in London, for in September 1658 he signs, second of twenty Friends' names, a long address to the Protector Richard and his Council on the sufferings of Friends and on other oppressions that prevailed in the nation.⁵ In the spring he had written a paper (signed in June, 1658, but not published till 1659), *A Word of Reproof and Advice to my late Fellow-Souldiers and Officers . . .*, in which he attacked hireling ministry, and especially the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge as its nurseries. It is written with much circumstantial detail about customs, ceremonies, dress and extravagance at Oxford, even to the distinctive customs of different colleges which he names, so that one concludes the author must himself have been a student at the University. His name does not occur, however, in the published registers of Oxford or Cambridge matriculates, though his kinsman and namesake, who died in 1621, was at Exeter College, Oxford.

The tract mentioned above was published, with five shorter papers by the same author appended. They appeal to men to heed the Light of Christ in them which will deliver them from imperfection, but there is a preponderance of denunciation against wickedness, cruelty, oppression, persecution, privilege, ranks of nobility, and there are expressions indicating belief that the end of all things is at hand. One of the papers is signed "By an

⁴ *Extracts from State Papers*, p. 156.

⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 39-45.

owner of the sword in its place . . . , but an enemy to Tyranny, Truce-breakers . . . E.B." Another finds no room "for the whole rabble of Duke, Marquesse, Lord, Knight, Gentleman by patents" but owns "the Military chief or inferior Captain" and "the just Souldier, whether he be horse or foot," and is signed "By a true lover of a True, Just, Meek, Gentle, Noble-man, who hates nor fears no man, and cannot give flattering titles, or respects the person of any man, E.B."

In 1659 Byllynge was twice in touch with Parliament as a representative of Friends. On April 16th he was called to the bar of the House of Commons with John Crook, about a petition to the Speaker from a great number of Friends assembled in Westminster Hall, asking for the release of Friends in prison.⁶ He was also one of the one hundred sixty-four to offer, a few days before this, to lie body for body in prison if those now confined could be released.

In September he was one of the two Friends, Francis Howgill being the other, to receive at the hands of Parliament the release of James Nayler.⁷

Meantime he made a journey into the west country, probably to visit his family. Alexander Parker, who was with Fox in Scotland in 1657, writes to him from Wiltshire in August that he has seen Edward Byllynge lately and hopes to go with him to Cornwall.⁸ Parliament this summer spent many days over bills for establishing militia throughout the country. Commissions were granted by the house, and many are the lists of names in its journals. We know that there were several Friends among those appointed and that this troubled George Fox, Alex-

⁶ *Journals of the House of Commons*; also *Letters of Early Friends*, 62ff.

⁷ Spence MSS., III, 58.

⁸ Swarthmore MSS., III, 143.

ander Parker and others; Fox himself was offered a colonelcy.⁹ The abjuration of Charles Stuart mentioned in the letter printed above must have referred to this matter. The terms of the engagement included this abjuration and were to be subscribed by officers and soldiers and also members of Parliament.¹⁰

I have not been able to find in the Journals of the Commons the case apparently referred to in the letter. The writer's statement possibly refers to the debating of the terms of the engagement to be taken by all commissioners, which, if he were a candidate, might be said to have covered his case. But the reference remains obscure. We must note that the writer states that his refusal to accept a militia commission was because it involved taking an oath. He does not mention an objection to the use of arms; this accords with the views expressed in Byllynge's pamphlets. He stands apparently nearer to those Friends who did accept commissions, William Meade for London, Humphrey Lower for Cornwall, besides others. The prophets of Quakerism lived a truth which Byllynge had seen, had been convinced of, was even ready to suffer for, but had not in all its fulness made his own. He stood in some need of Fox's warning to Friends tempted in those uncertain times. As lovers of liberty they saw all that many had fought for, hanging in the balance. In Fox's *Journal*, under 1659, the offer of places and commands by the Committee of Safety is mentioned too. Edward Byllynge could not drop his old faith in the efficacy of a right social order, rightly imposed by the right people.

Attention now turns to two tracts which have been attributed by Joseph Smith doubtfully either to Burrough

⁹ M E Hirst: *Quakers in Peace and War*

¹⁰ *Journals of the House of Commons*, under 3 Sept., 1659

or Byllynge.¹¹ The later, *An Alarm to All Flesh*, 1660, avows its authorship on its penultimate page as by "me Edward Billing," a rare case of oversight by Joseph Smith. The former must now engage attention, for historically it is of the greatest interest. Its title in full is *A Mite of Affection, Manifested in 31 Proposals, Offered to all the Sober and Free-born People within this Common-wealth; Tending and Tendred unto them for a settlement in this the day and hour of the World's Distraction and Confusion. Yet a little while and the light is with ye; but the Night cometh shortly wherein no man can work. London: Printed for Giles Calvert, 1659.*

Thomason's copy in the British Museum is dated 28th October. This little quarto tract of twelve pages is a draft constitution, in thirty-one articles, for the government of a free Commonwealth of England, under which men would be liberated forever from the present oppressions. Viewed as a political document no doubt it is crude, primitive, inadequate, but we are concerned with its author and his intention.

The following is a brief summary of its provisions:

1. The magistrate is to have no coercive power in matters of religion. Freedom for all Christians. No tithes.
2. No compulsion to take an oath. All false witness equally punishable.
3. No exclusion from public office and trust except of rebels against the Commonwealth.
4. No late persecutor eligible for public office or trust.
5. Trial by jury; accused may take reasonable exception to judge, juryman or witness.
6. Revision of all servile tenures or copyholds, as relics of the Conquest.
7. A thief not to be executed but to restore to the injured party, up to fourfold. Capital punishment for murder.

¹¹ J. Smith: *Catalogue of Friends Books*, I, 270.

8. Administration of law to be decentralised. Law to be printed plain for all to read. The relevant law to be read to accused before the court.

9. County courts of record to register all kinds of civil contracts to prevent dispute and fraud.

10. Every person to be free to plead his own case in court.

11. Civil cases to be tried by a parish jury with appeal.

12. Trial of capital cases twice a year in the county town.

13. Felons to await trial in county gaol. No trial in absence of accused.

14. Ten parishes to make a "hundred," the unit for electing one or two members to Parliament, annually, "to branch out the proposals now proposed and to make other good laws." No late persecutor to be elected, at least for the first year.

15. Public military or civil officers guilty of fraud to be disqualified for life.

16. Property of executed persons not to be forfeit by their dependents.

17. Debtors to be obliged to pay so far as estates allow, and set at liberty.

18. Bad gaolers to be dismissed, gaols made strong, warm and decent, and no dungeons used.

19. All able-bodied poor to be set at work, children and the infirm provided for, and no beggars allowed.

20. All images and places of idolatry in public, nourishing popery, to be abolished.

21. Gaming and profane pastimes forbidden.

22. Every tradesman who has served his apprenticeship and has the means shall be free to emigrate to any English Dominion overseas.

23. Weights and measures to be uniform throughout the Commonwealth and Dominions.

24. Revenue of forfeited estates to be used by the state to maintain widows and orphans of those who served the Commonwealth in the late wars. Any surplus to be used to pay off public debt. Creditors of the public to be satisfied forthwith.

25. Taxation to be proportionate to estates. No tax payer to be excluded from office on account of religious belief provided he has not been a rebel or a persecutor.

26. All who for conscience sake have been ejected from

office "by the late single person" are to be restored to their places.

27. Government of the Commonwealth and its Dominions to be by annual Parliaments. Those elected to be tried as to eligibility under these articles by a commission of 20 or 30 persons chosen by each persuasion, who must themselves satisfy Articles 3 & 4. Their work to be done in three months.

28. Free trade between all English, Irish and Scottish ports.

29. The first Parliament to establish Fundamental Laws for a durable settlement. Any member subsequently moving their alteration to be excluded.

30. All offices to be reviewed annually by some appointed by Parliament to do so. Fraudulent officers to restore fourfold and be perpetually disqualified.

31. Liberty of conscience shall not extend to trespass or violence against any other. Elaborated, with some bias against those who use outward ceremonies in worship and favouring those who are moved to declare against "false worship."

The author is throughout passionately concerned with freedom, and with guarantees against oppression, persecution, fraud, cruelty, but not quite impartial in his application of them. The pamphlet concludes with a postscript (*italics mine*):

And this *I* commend to all the sober and free-born people of this Commonwealth as a testimony *I* bear to *my* Country, and unto every Individual person in it, this being an essay towards its speedy firm and future settlement on such a bases as may fully answer the just righteous principle of God in every man's conscience, unto which *I* leave it, and as it leads any to add to the furtherance of this (good intended) work it will be acceptable to *me* and unto all the upright hearted on the earth . . .

The two copies at Friends House show verbal differences which are evidence of the authorship. In one copy the pronouns indicated are printed in the plural, *we*, *our*,

us. In this copy they have been altered with a pen to *I* (three times) *my*, *me*. The *I*, which is quite distinctive, is exactly similar to that in the handwriting of Edward Byllynge.¹² A few printer's errors in the first are corrected in the second impression.

He probably wrote it feeling sure that such an essay would receive the endorsement of Friends. It was set up in type and one must suppose a few at least were distributed to leading Friends, possibly others more widely. On their inability to share in the project, Edward Byllynge gave it to the world on his own responsibility. Questions at once rise, such as: how many gave their opinion against issuing it as from the group; did Fox see it; how might its adoption have affected the political situation, or the newly gathered Quaker movement? The prospect of offering a remedy for the nation in its hour of confusion would be tempting; it may have been only two or three who persuaded Byllynge to keep it a personal offering. One feels glad they took the view they did, and glad too that he went on and published it himself.

This reconstruction of events is supported by a sentence in Byllynge's published letter offering Friends free land in New Jersey in 1681. Here he speaks of his desire to be vindicated after his bankruptcy, among "at least such of my Friends who had known and tryed me at Heart, and fully experienced my former Love to God's Truth and People (even in a day of Tryal, when its well known that both Kingdoms were laid in the Ballance before me)." (*Penna. Mag. of Hist.* LXI (1937), 88 ff.).

It puts right back into the Commonwealth the conception which long afterwards came to birth in West New Jersey. Commissions and Agreements of the proprietors dated March, 3, 1676, and the Constitution and First

¹² Facsimile in *Pennsylvania Magazine of History*, LXI (1937), 88.

Laws of West New Jersey dated November 1681, were both signed by Edward Byllynge. In the former he signs first of about one hundred fifty signatories; Penn as one of his trustees signs fourth. Similarities between the tract and these charters suggest Byllynge's inspiration and assistance in drafting the New Jersey constitution, in which hitherto historians have always seen Penn's as the principal hand. How far these points of likeness go in showing Byllynge the author and how far they are common to these and other constitutions will, I hope, be investigated by someone more qualified by special knowledge.

Similarities that have struck me and which I do not find in Penn's *Frame* are the inalterability laid down for the constitution and the predilection for tens in grouping and in subdividing the community. There are other points in common, some of which occur again in the charter of Pennsylvania, and it would be strange if Penn owed nothing to his association with the old Cromwellian, twenty years his senior, who had long since looked beyond seas and had published a constitution for an English Republic when Penn was a lad just turning sixteen. Nor in this case is it surprising that Penn's own *Frame* gave in some respects less freedom than the Charter of New Jersey.

We do not know who in 1659 read or noticed Byllynge's *Mite of Affection*, or whether any debated it. However disappointed he may have been at its lack of result, the desire which made him write it remained; nor was he out of fellowship with Friends on account of it. In December he signed the postscript with fourteen others issuing *A Declaration from the People Called Quakers to the Present Distracted Nation of England*, of which the author is Edward Burrough. This is in a very different vein from the last, points out the inadequacy of political means, disavows partisanship, and appeals for a hearkening to the voice

of the spirit, "for men are yet too wise in their own wisdom and cannot receive the Councel of the Lord that they may prosper, and therefore are they, and must they be confounded amongst themselves; and dashed one against another, till they learn the way of Righteousness and Truth."

Shortly after this, Monk's army came to London from Scotland in a mood impatient of factions and sects, their leader ready for the Restoration, and a persecution began of Friends and others in their meetings. Edward Byllynge and his wife were among those in Westminster who suffered violent cruelty, incidents which he described in a long letter (Feb. 1660) to William Meade, preserved in a contemporary copy in Swarthmore MSS., V, 93. The version in *Letters of Early Friends*, pp. 75-79, is abbreviated in many places and omits many of the political names in the MS. We learn that Byllynge protested personally to the Speaker of the House of Commons, to Colonel Rich and to General Monk himself. After a further protest by Richard Hubberthorne, Monk's order not to abuse Friends in their meetings was made, March 9, 1660. With the Restoration accomplished, the spirit of persecution against all "sectaries" grew, the Oath of Allegiance its principal weapon. The sun of republicanism had set and men of Byllynge's sympathies saw their political hopes vanish. But the experience into which he had been initiated by Fox grew as the times became harder, and there is an inward sight that grows in his writings though he still hopes apparently for some miraculous intervention on what is so obviously the right side. His *Alarm to All Flesh*, December 10th, 1660, is written as a "prisoner for the testimony of Jesus who said *Swear not at all*," corroborating the evidence in the "E.B." letter for the reason of his imprisonment. The title invites "the true seeker forth-

with to fly for his life out of the short lived Babylon into the Life; out of the words, into the Word; out of the many and changeable likenesses into Him, the same yesterday to-day, for ever and ever." After a warning to the wicked of doom to come quickly, he says the Lord will "pity the little little Remnant, his own Seed, and grasp them in the hollow of his hand, and hide at least a Remnant of a Remnant under his own Pavilion." In this tract he uses two phrases which occur in the E.B. letter printed above "we have run through a troop," "we leap over a wall."

That letter was probably written between this and the next tract, also composed in Gatehouse Prison, Westminster, 9th & 11th May, 1661, and entitled *Words in the Word*, addressed to Friends, exhorting them to let an open, living, large, noble heart, a bountiful sympathizing, generous soul possess, be in and among them all, and to dwell in the true inward power, eschewing false imitations and every temptation to conform out of the life, out of the Cross. He still hopes for some wonderful release of the godly from persecution. In August we get a glimpse of happier circumstances when Alexander Parker writes to George Fox from Tregangeeves in Cornwall, "Loveday Hambly and Edward Billing remember their dear love to thee."¹⁸

He returns to the struggle with a defence of freedom to worship dated 7th May 1662, entitled *For Every Individual . . . Magistrate in the Land . . .*, in which he defies the worst that persecutors can do with his person; "my outward man is simply and freely offered up to him who gave me breath"; "I can truly say, (if it be possible) 'Father forgive them all' . . . but I can hardly say 'Father, they know not what they do.' "

Yet somewhere in him the old rebel spirit persists and

¹⁸ Swarthmore MSS, III, 139.

he misses a chance to ease the sufferings of Friends when in November, 1662, he is sent for to meet General Monk and the Council and to give a written promise that Friends will never take up arms against the King. He refuses to bind himself or them "as free men," much to the distress of Ellis Hookes and others¹⁴ at this perversity. He is now a suspected person, is mentioned in an informer's letter to the authorities,¹⁵ and figures in Secretary Williamson's secret *Spy Book*.¹⁶

We know next to nothing of his life during the sixties. He continued to live in Westminster and published one or two tracts. *A Faithful Testimony . . . for the Legislators and the Church . . . found persecuting the innocent* (1664) is a spirited and defiant protest, somewhat violent in language. *A Certaine Sound; or An Alarm Sounded to the Persecuting Episcopahians . . .* (1665) is mainly a heartfelt cry of protest against the cruelties inflicted on Friends, especially the barbarous treatment of those fifty-four in the *Black Eagle* who had been sentenced to banishment, about half of whom died as the ship lay in the Thames. The great plague then on the city is a judgment of God. But there is a noble passage on the martyr's victory, and exultation that persecution "so far from depressing the everlasting Gospel . . . shall add life and growth to the truth of our forever blessed and most precious Cause . . . And some of our very little ones now living shall rejoyce . . . that they were the offspring of a martyr or that their parents in any measure stood faithful." He concludes with the following rhymed prayer.

And, Lord, if what's already done, and in their hearts to do
Be not enough to fill the measure up of those

¹⁴ Letter in *Extracts from State Papers*, p. 153.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 156

¹⁶ *Congregational Hist: Soc. Trans.* V. 246.

Who on thy holy People for their pure Conscience do impose,
On me lay on thy ponderous weight, give me but strength
to bear;

Permit them Lord my blood to drink, and flesh to tear.

Yet, Lord, I'm not ith' haste, but on thy holy leisure cry,

"How long, how long! O Lord my God, most holy, just, and
high?"

For, Lord, I know deliverance to thy Seed, nor evil to the
City can be done,

Good or Vengeance wrought thereon, but by thy holy self
alone.

Therefore freely, and with all my heart, the manner, way, and
final disquisition of these things,

I leave to thee, my God, who art the King of Kings,

Transmuter and establisher of all things.

Early in 1670 he is himself a sufferer under the Conventicle Act, as appears by a letter to Lord Arlington, dated 31st May that year. We learn that his goods have been distrained and put to sale but no one has bought them. He is the only one the writer has heard of [in the locality, one supposes] who has suffered the extremity of the Act.¹⁷ Apparently his neighbors sympathized enough not to buy his things.

His purchase in 1674, with John Fenwick, of West New Jersey from John, Baron Berkeley of Stratton, for £1000, his quarrel with Fenwick, his bankruptcy, William Penn's mediation in the first and his trusteeship in the second trouble, have been dealt with in the histories of New Jersey and of Quakerism in America. Nor is it proposed here to review the disagreement that existed in 1680-1683 as to whether Governor Samuel Jenings derived his authority from Edward Byllynge, the proprietor, or by the appointment of the settlers. He would not be the only founder to feel that right government was more safely

¹⁷ *Extracts from State Papers*, p. 307.

guarded by the father of a colony than by its children.

His constitution of 1659 contained several references to English Dominions overseas and to emigration. He may have cherished the notion of a plantation all these years. There is just a hint in the letter mentioned below that makes one suppose the gradual improvement of his affairs after his bankruptcy may not be unconnected with his wife's death. Was it for financial reasons that were temporary that he went into the New Jersey scheme with John Fenwick, who, when disagreement arose, received so small a share by the arbitration?¹⁸

Among the Pepys MSS. at Cambridge is a letter of Byllynge's to "Friends and people of all sorts whatsoever."¹⁹ It is dated March 22nd, 1674, and expresses repentance for his part in the debts "run into by him and his late wife." He hopes "no reasonable or tender hearted man or woman will too far oppress with their tongues him that's already overwhelmed in sorrow, neither any one charge this my miscarriage upon the principal people of God called Quakers, for their principle is holy and true and they are clear of these things."

¹⁸ *The Description of West Jersey, . . . 1676*, (reprinted by Fulmer Mood from the rare broadside at Friends House, in *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society Vol. LIV*, No. 1, Jan., 1936), was more probably by Edward Byllynge than by William Penn, to whom it has hitherto been ascribed. The mention of the purchase of the territory from Lord Berkeley by John Fenwick, "nevertheless to and for the use of Edward Billynge," supports the view of their relationship that I have suggested above. The last paragraph speaks of the resolution by the help of God inviolably to persevere every individual's property and liberty of conscience "from all manner of invasions and violations whatsoever." This is more in Byllynge's impulsive than Penn's measured style, a view supported by the issue and by the tenor of the *Epistle* by Penn, Lawrie and Lucas the same year (reprinted in S. Smith's *History of New Jersey* 1775, and A. C. Myers' *Narratives of Early Penna, N. J., and Del.*, 1912). If the *Description* were by Penn he would be disclaiming his own work, but he rather implies the reverse in the opening sentence referring to "a paper . . . in the which our names were mentioned"; and the disclaimer of any intention to defend liberty with arms refers to the last paragraph, which most bespeaks Byllynge.

¹⁹ G. Fox: *Short Journal* (Cambridge), pp. 308-9.

There is much in these few lines. Burdened with debt and bereavement, he is repentant for error, appeals for consideration and, in words which hide as much as they suggest, reminds Friends that the debt is not all of his making, though he is left to bear it alone. One sees again that picture in Fox's *Journal* in 1657²⁰ of Lillias Byllynge, the wife of a cornet, coming into the inn at Leith to bait Fox with her extravagance, with "a great deal of coral in her hand" which she threw down on the table before him. How much of her husband's present troubles may be due to something in her disposition we do not know, but he must have felt it considerably for him to touch on it however slightly at such a time. His anxiety to keep the Quaker name clear from his errors adds a beautiful touch to the character which his known deeds and words portray for us. We see a man passionately devoted to freedom, brave, loyal, tender-hearted, impulsive but teachable, with a window of his soul always open to the Light since Fox first pointed him clearly to it, one whose vigorous assertiveness always found it easier to resist evil than to overcome evil with good, but who strove to live as he described himself over his signature in his first tract in 1659,²¹ "A Friend to perfection and a believer in that infallible Jesus, who saves his people from their sins, failings and imperfections, but a professed enemy to that Hellish doctrine of imperfection."

He never visited his colony, but remained in London. Our last record of his life is of his appearance before the Recorder of London for attendance at meeting in December, 1684, when he was imprisoned three weeks for non-payment of his fine.²²

²⁰ Cambridge ed. I, 297.

²¹ *A Word of Reproof*, p. 55.

²² Besse, *Sufferings of the Quakers*.

He died of phthisis in London on the 16th January, 1687,²³ in the parish of St. Botolph, Aldersgate, in the compass of Peel Monthly Meeting. His place of burial is not recorded, but, from the place of death, was probably Bunhill Fields.

²³ Dates in this paper have been translated when necessary into those of the modern calendar.

Hebraica and the Jews in Early Quaker Interest
Henry Joel Cadbury

VI

HEBRAICA AND THE JEWS IN EARLY QUAKER INTEREST

Interest in things Hebrew was not perhaps to be expected of the early Friends. The Children of Light were often accused of ignoring the Scriptures. They certainly taught that a theological education was not necessary for preaching the gospel and was not contributory to receiving the same Spirit as gave the Scriptures forth. So they spoke slightly of knowledge of the original languages. Fox recalled that Pilate could write in Greek and Latin and Hebrew. At the same time they were eager to confirm their views precisely from the Scriptures, and to employ such philological scholarship as would support their controversial positions.

In using, therefore, Hebrew learning they were not merely applying the *argumentum ad hominem* to "priests and professors" of the more orthodox churches. They believed in scripture authority, both as resident in the original in comparison with the English translation and as embodied in the signification of Hebrew words and names. Several of them brought over into their Quaker experience the training and habits of a theological education in Hebrew. A partial list of "priests convinced" is given by George Fox.¹ Though some of them had been lay teachers, two at least had had a University education in divinity. One was Samuel Fisher (1605-1665), a Master of Arts from Oxford. His Hebrew learning appears here and

¹ Cambridge Journal, ii, 322, 323.

there throughout his voluminous writings.² His son bore the good scriptural name Hallelujah. The other was Thomas Lawson (1630–1691). He was educated at Cambridge, but like Fisher resigned his lucrative living and threw in his lot with Friends. His writings, too, disclose his Hebrew learning and we have an early letter from him to Margaret Fell describing his efforts to buy a Hebrew Lexicon. Such a book was evidently difficult to acquire in the north of England and Lawson could not afford to pay for one. Finding a man at Newcastle who had one he asked him for it and prevailed on him to part with it, borrowing ten shillings of Thomas Turner. He now asks to have the loan paid out of the general fund expecting that his use of the Lexicon will be of service to the Quaker cause.³ Lawson supported himself as teacher of a school at Great Strickland and as a private tutor. It is evident that in this capacity he still had use for some of the ancient languages.⁴

In Scotland also were theologically trained converts to Quakerism. One thinks of Robert Barclay (1648–1690), whose education had been received partly in France, and of George Keith, M.A. (1636–1716), described by Gerard

² John Faldo, *Quakerism No Christianity*, 1673, p. 82, calls Fisher "the best scholar that ever professed Quakerism." Another opponent of Quakerism, known only by his pseudonym "Trepidantium Malleus," agrees in his *William Penn and the Quakers*, 1696, p. 16: "However, something of learning thou [Penn] hast, Barclay more, but Samuel Fisher most of all."

³ Swarthmore MSS. i, 241 (undated). Cf. Webb, *Fells of Swarthmoor Hall*, second edit., 1867, p. 57; H. G. Crosfield, *Margaret Fox of Swarthmoor Hall*, 1913, p. 41. Evidently George Taylor, the treasurer of the fund, could not be appealed to directly to pay for the book. (See note 4 to p. 326 in *Cambridge Journal of George Fox*, II, 468.) At the same time Lawson bought from another man for five shillings a Greek lexicon to the New Testament.

⁴ Among his pupils in Hebrew was Christopher Yeats, a young priest, who in spite of all that Lawson could do to prevent it secured the love of his daughter Ruth and finally married her. Thomas Lawson bequeathed to him "Camden's Britannica, my Hebrew Lexicon, and all my manuscripts." M. Webb, *op. cit.*, pp. 326–9.

Croese as "a student of Philosophy and Divinity . . . a good Mathematician and afterward a Chaplain in a certain Noble Family." The Hebrew interests of Keith are more evident than those of Barclay even in his earlier writings, but they increased after his contacts at Ragley with the cabbalistic students Henry More, Countess Conway and Francis Mercurius van Helmont.

Less even than today was a knowledge of Hebrew among Christians limited to the clergy. It is likely that some of the best early Quaker Hebraists had never received a theological education. Some were school teachers by profession, but not like Lawson and Keith as an alternative after preparing for the ministry. Among these may be mentioned Furlly, Richardson and Stubbs. Benjamin Furlly (1636-1714) was a wealthy business man from Colchester, who before 1660 had joined Friends and settled in Holland. Apart from his participation in the publication of the *Battle-Door* to be mentioned below, the principal evidence of his learning, though not conclusive proof of his reading, is *Bibliotheca Furliana*⁵ or the printed sale catalogue of the huge library which he left at his death. The books and indeed some of his learning may well have been acquired in his later years when his allegiance to Quakerism was less close. Zacharias von Uffenbach, himself a bibliophile and scholar, visiting Furlly in 1710, was astounded "that this man, a merchant, should be so well versed in Latin, Hebrew, the more so as he formerly had no means at his disposal, and had only acquired them here of late."⁶

Richard Richardson (c. 1623-1689) was a schoolmaster

⁵ Rotterdam, 1714.

⁶ Quoted by Julius Friedrich Sachse, *Benjamin Furlly, English Merchant of Rotterdam*, 1895, pp. 18ff. In the same account B. Furlly gave them to understand that he adhered to no special religion. A full account of Furlly may be expected in William I. Hull's *Swarthmore College Monographs*, Number Five.

until in 1681 he became the paid clerk of the Society of Friends in London. His learning in ancient history appears in his published writings and is suggested by Fox's request that he search all the libraries to learn whether heathen or Jews used a priest in their marriage ceremonies and by his well documented reply in the negative.⁷ From his personal library came some of a number of books on the Bible which have descended in the custody of London Friends to this day. Among them, though not marked with his name, are a Hebrew psalter (no title page), George Buchanan, *Paraphrasis Psalmorum* (1580), two Hebrew Bibles (Amsterdam, 1630 and Geneva, 1619) and two polyglot works by Elias Hutter, viz. his *Novum Testamentum Harmonicum* (Noribergae, 1502) and his *Dictionarium Harmonicum Biblicum* (Noribergae, 1598).

The book last mentioned had been the property of John Stubbs (1618–1674). After leaving the army he was a schoolmaster at Lancaster and also taught ancient languages to private pupils.⁸ Fox refers to him as a scholar and his learning was respected even by his opponents. In the public debate in Rhode Island against Roger Williams in 1672 which he shared with John Burnyeat and William Edmundson, his opponent reports a discussion on a phrase in Isaiah 9:

John Stubbs said the *Hebrew word* was *Abi Haad*, &c and it was rendered *Pater Eternitatis*: I replied that it was rendered (and that more near the *Hebrew*) *Pater seculi*, or *seculorum*: But I told him it was not a seasonable time and place for him and me to spend much time about the Translation of the word: he said he had brought the *Hebrew Bible* with him, and

⁷ Dix Manuscripts, Z 26, at Friends' House, London. See *Jnl. F. H. S.* i, 1903, 62f. For his learning see *ibid.*, 66f. George Fox describes him as "a man fitt to perfect scollars rather than to pupill them" (Letter to William Penn from Worcester prison, 10. VIII. 1674, *Jnl. F. H. S.* vii, 1910, 74.)

⁸ *Biographical Memoirs*, 1854.

it may be he understood the *Hebrew* and the *Greek* and other Languages as well as myself and better too: I was about to say that they were wonderfully altered and changed from their former principles and practises, for heretofore they have professed to me that they had no need of Books, no not of the Scripture itself, for they had the Teacher within them that gave forth Scripture, &c. if now they were persuaded to study the Holy Scripture and the Translation of it, and to examine the Translations and Copies of them.⁹

In the same year Stubbs with James Lancaster came to Boston seeking a debate with the "priests" there. In this he was disappointed though he disputed with John Oxenbridge "in Latin which he spake fluently."¹⁰ Another reference by Williams to Stubbs's learning is quoted by John Whiting to Cotton Mather apropos his part in compiling the *Battle-Door*.

It was known, that John Stubbs, the Chief Author of it was a very learned Man, and had thirty Languages (almost as many as are in that Book) as C.M.'s Champion, Roger Williams, confessed.¹¹

It would not be surprising if even some early Quakeresses knew a modicum of Hebrew. For some time a knowledge of that tongue had been considered an important part of a lady's education in England as later also in Colonial New England and women of royal rank or lower had become really proficient in it.¹² Among Friends

⁹ G. Fox Digg'd out of his Burrowes, 1676, p. 61 Cf. p. 6: "John Stubbs, a man knowing the *Greek* and *Hebrew*." In another anti-Quaker piece almost unknown, *An Answer to a Letter Sent from Mr. Coddington of Rhode Island to Governour Leveret of Boston in what concerns R. W.*, [1677], p. 5, Roger Williams again refers to the discussion on this Hebrew term at the public debate.

¹⁰ William Coddington, letter to John Leverett, 21 VIII.1677, printed in *Jnl. F. H. S.* ix, 1912, p. 131.

¹¹ *Truth and Innocency Defended*, 1702, p. 113f. Cf. letter of William Coddington to J. Winthrop, Jr., 23 VI 1672; "he is a larned man, as witness the battele doore in 35 languages." *Mass. Hist. Coll. Series* 4, vii. 292.

¹² See G. A. Kohut: "Royal Hebraists," in *Jewish Studies in Memory of Israel Abrahams*, 1927, pp. 221ff., which refers in turn to M. Stein-

one would naturally think of Margaret Fell in this connection, but in spite of her writings to the Jews, to be mentioned below, some of which included Hebrew quotations¹³ or were translated bodily into Hebrew, I think she probably did not use the language herself. In fact one may infer from a letter of Ellis Hookes that she was not at home even in Latin:

Thou wrote to me about buying Rufinus his Antiquities. I suppose thee judgest it to be in English, but it is in Latin & never was translated y^e I can hear.¹⁴

There is a definite statement, however, in Croese's *History* that her daughter Sarah Fell "applied herself to the study of the Hebrew Tongue, that she might be more prompt and ready in defending and proving their Doctrine and Principles from the Holy Scriptures, and in this study the progress she made was great, that she wrote books of her Religion in that language."¹⁵ The statement can hardly be trusted. An anonymous but well informed early critic of Croese expresses his doubt in 1696: "*Haec non de Sara sed forte aliquatenus de Isabella Fella dicenda.*"¹⁶ But even her sister Isabel's slighter knowledge of Hebrew cannot at this date be confirmed.

schneider "Hebraistinnen" in *Hebraische Bibliographie*, xx, pp. 65-69. Among others Anna Maria van Schurman (1607-1678), a Labadist often regarded as a Quaker, may be mentioned. See W. I. Hull, *William Penn and the Dutch Quaker Migration to Pennsylvania*, 1935, pp. 10ff.

¹³ *A Loving Salutation to the Seed of Abraham among the Jewes*, 1656 (but not the reprint), contains at the end three lines in Hebrew (probably from Deut. i:1 and xxx:6).

¹⁴ Swarth. MSS. i, 60, London 8.V.1672. Was it to Margaret Fell, Senior, or to her daughter Margaret, writing for her, that we should attribute the spelling of *habeas corpus* in a letter to George Fox in 1660, "Horpuss scorpions" (*Camb. Jnl.* i. 373)? George Fox's own Latinity in an unpublished holograph may be compared—"horpuss corpus."

¹⁵ Eng. Trans. Part I. p. 47. To this questionable authority must refer the statement in *Jnl. F. H. S.* xii, 1915, p. 116, "we know from other sources that she had learned Hebrew."

¹⁶ *Dilucidationes quaedam valdae necessariae in Gerardi Croesi historiam Quakerianam*, Amsterdam, 1696. The author calls himself Philaethes, a pseudonym too common to identify.

There were other women in the Society of Friends more likely than the family at Swarthmoor Hall to know Hebrew. It is clear that in the absence of official membership at the period Lady Anne, Viscountess Conway, must be reckoned a Quaker in her later years. Her extraordinary learning, though primarily mathematical and philosophical, can hardly have failed to include some proficiency in the ancient languages like that of her Quaker associates Keith and van Helmont.¹⁷

It is in fact in van Helmont and the continental converts to Quakerism that Hebrew learning is best exemplified. Like his famous patient at Ragley Hall, Baron Francis Mercurius van Helmont must now be reckoned a Friend. Although Friends did not claim him afterwards, he was long in real association with them. Not only was he fully trained in classical Hebrew learning but he was a thorough student of the Kabbala, in touch with Christian Hebraists like Christian Knorr von Rosenroth (mostly called by his pseudonym Paganus) and in time influencing Keith and perhaps Barclay as well as Lady Conway and Henry More. His enthusiasm for Hebrew is shown in his writings, especially in his theory that Hebrew was the original language of mankind, a theory which in part was responsible for his attempt to reconstitute it a sort of Esperanto or international tongue and for what has had more useful results,—his careful examination of phonetic laws with a view to teaching lip-reading to the deaf.¹⁸

Another German whose career, somewhat resembling

¹⁷ For the atmosphere of her home see Marjorie Nicolson, *Conway Letters*, 1930, Index, *sv.* Cabbalism. Of course More and Paganus were at the very time making the Hebrew writings available in Latin.

¹⁸ A study of van Helmont is in preparation by Miss Grace B. Sherer, of Kent, Ohio. Therefore I do not undertake even to summarize his Hebrew interests. Similarly a full life of George Keith by Mrs. Ethel Williams Kirby, of Providence, Rhode Island, is ready for publication, and I do not attempt to analyze his scholarship.

that of van Helmont, has lately come to my attention is Christian Lodowick.¹⁹ Reared as a young tutor in the family of a cabbalist, probably the same von Rosenroth just mentioned, he too may well have learned some of the Hebrew behind the Latin of the *Cabbala Denudata*, though as a school teacher in Rhode Island or a controversialist for or against Friends we have no evidence of such knowledge. Unfortunately we know little about him and that little only for the period 1684 to 1695.

Among Quaker converts from Germany must be mentioned Hilary Prache (1614-1679) and his son-in-law, Johann Georg Matern. The former after a youth spent in the mines of Hungary in search of the philosopher's stone took up the study of Talmudic literature. For ten years he was pastor at Diersdorf and for five at Goldberg, but his services were not welcome because of his unorthodox interests,—in Valentin Weigel, in Jacob Boehme and in the Schwenckfelders. On June 4th, 1674 he migrated with all his family to England. Critical German Lutherans²⁰ writing regretfully in 1705 of his falling away never-

¹⁹ See my article in *Jnl. F. H. S.* xxxiii, 1936, 20ff. On the other hand another German immigrant to America, Francis Daniel Pastorius, though much better known and probably better educated, being trained for the law, widely travelled and a master of several modern languages as well as of Greek and Latin, shows neither in his writings nor in his lists of books owned or used any knowledge of Hebrew.

²⁰ Writers in *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, 1706, Section 8, p. 446, and in *Nova Litteraria Germaniae*, August, 1705, p. 290, translated and quoted in *Jnl. F. H. S.* xvi, 1919, pp. 8f., where letters from Prache and Matern written in 1676 to Martin John at Laubgrund are also reproduced. The notes to these letters promised *Jnl. F. H. S.* xvi, 1919, 106, do not seem to have been published. In Fox's memoranda (*Camb. Jnl.* ii 324) the family are described as from Poland, in C. Fell Smith (see below) as from Hungary. See on Prache, *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, xxvi, 1888, p. 498f. The title of his most important work may be given more fully, *R. Jedaja Happenini Judaei Hispani בקשה sive Meditatio, Latine explicata et notis illustrata operd . . . H. Prachii*. In an unpublished account of the rise of Friends Fox says: "In Silesia a priest and his wife and family received God's truth and they came to England and one of his sons was a very able school master and taught school in England. His father was about eighty years old and a great outward scholar and died in the truth in England."

theless admit that he was "thoroughly versed in the Oriental Languages and other studies," a man "whose knowledge has been highly esteemed by such celebrated individuals as Geier, Acoluth, Wagenfeil, and Mehlfürer." And another characterizes him with a reference to his publications as follows:

Vir certissime doctissimus & linguae imprimis sanctae eleganter peritus, sed fanaticus Schwenckfeldianus, Quackerus & Boehmista, Publicavit tractatum

1. R. Jud. Happenini. Bakshah. Lipsiae 1662
2. Librum Rbb. Nishmath Adam
3. Librum B'hibath o'lam

We are fortunate in having some original letters of these strange exiles, some published in 1706 in German and in English, others extant in Dutch and hitherto unpublished.²¹ The spiritual reminiscences and experiences of Hilarius Prache do not concern us here. He says that he was trained from his youth in the Hebrew language and spent most of his time while preceptor for six years at Breslau on the Hebrew language and in the Rabbinical writings, translating some of them into Latin, part of which was published afterwards in Latin. "My name correctly given is Hilarius Prachy²² and this is well known in Holland and England to the *Professores Hebraeae linguae* through the work . . . *Bakkascha* . . . which you

²¹ See preceding note. The unpublished letters are in Friends Reference Library, London (Port. 11 pp 7-12 and 45-58) and were written by Prache to Jan Claus the Friend at Amsterdam in 1672 and 1673. I use a rough translation of them kindly made for me a few years ago by my friend Willem van Unnik of Haarlem.

²² In a lost letter he gave his name evidently as Israel Harpiuc. In the next letter he gives the right order of the same letters transposed as Hilarius Prache. In the third letter as quoted he writes his names correctly. The use of anagram was perhaps from fear of detection or censorship, but it may have been a common conceit. One of his correspondents (Martin John) had a pseudonym *Matthaeus Israel*. A printed use of anagram is found in the signature "*Eclea-Nobj-moni*" to [Benjamin Coole's] *A Letter from a Gentleman in the City to his Kinsman in the Country, concerning the Quakers*, 1705.

may try to get in the bookshops in Amsterdam." Before accepting Quakerism "I did not know that even that power and ability [to sit quietly at the feet of Jesus only] depended on the inward turning towards the Light; the words of Luther, viz. that the study of the Hebrew language is part of Divine worship had an entrance in my mind and I thought it was all well with me." After a wonderful experience in the year 1669 "I resigned my Professorship of my own free will and went into the silence and am standing therein till this time four years later, having made no little progress and being fortified in the work of the Lord by the Quaker writings, with which I am in agreement in all particulars. I have also sold my library to the great rest of my soul, having finally given up and disposed of to another my special Hebrew collection, because they would keep me away and draw me back."

In England Prache made use of his learning for a livelihood though probably he did not use his Hebrew much and certainly not as a false substitute for the inward religion that he had come to know. Writing from London in the autumn of 1679 to correct reports in Germany of his being disillusioned and in want he says:

For over a year and a quarter I have been occupied at the Friends' Printing house with the correction of books published by them getting for it £10 a year, i.e., 44 Thalers. I make also Hornbecks school books for children attending school. Occasionally I translate Calvinistic and Dutch writings into the High German language.

With the money earned at silk weaving by his wife and daughter, and an allowance from Friends of free house, free coal, and £10 a year he was able to deny that he had "endured great need and privation regarding the temporal

means of support." We are told that later he was employed as translator and corrector at the printing press in Cambridge.²³

John (Hans Georgen) Matern, son-in-law of the preceding, was also a linguist. Before their migration he had been teacher at the local *gymnasium*. In England he was for six years assistant to Christopher Taylor at the famous Quaker school at Waltham Abbey, later Edmonton, where he soon acquired experience that would have warranted him in undertaking an English school of his own. He participated in the extraordinary children's revival at Waltham Abbey in 1679, but died in 1680.²⁴ In the year between Prache's death and his son's, Christopher Taylor published a text book entitled "*Compendium Trium Linguarum, Latinae, Graecae & Hebraicae*." J.M. provided the preface to the last, or Hebrew, section which he plainly ascribes to Prache:

My father-in-law H.P. being minded to give forth some directions how one in a few hours time might learn to read Hebrew, was prevented by death from publishing it.

Matern no doubt edited this part for the press, and the title page suggests that he had no less important part in the Greek and Latin sections. He was a linguist in his own right, if not actually a Hebraist. Though we know something of his family²⁵—his mother, daughter, and widow (the last remarried) all emigrated to Pennsylvania—his own career was brief and is little known.

Particular interest attaches to the knowledge of Hebrew on the part of George Fox. How much he knew is a

²³ C. Fell Smith, *Steven Crisp and his Correspondents, 1657-1692*, 1892, p. 15f.

²⁴ *Jnl. F. H. S.* x, 1913, 149-151. W. C. Braithwaite, *The Second Period of Quakerism*, pp. 526f. *The Testimony of John Matern*, 1680.

²⁵ *Jnl. F. H. S.* x, 1913, 114, 151-152.

question that has been discussed since the very day of his death.²⁶ It was raised by Francis Bugg and other opponents of Quakerism in connection with the *Battle-Door for Teachers and Professors to Learn Singular and Plural* published in 1660 in collaboration with Stubbs and Furly. Fox's initials appended to six of the thirty-five sections there was regarded as evidence of hypocrisy and it was asserted that his humble origin and education made it impossible that he could be master of these languages. Even in English he was regarded as scarcely literate.

George Whitehead, who himself was said to have "made a considerable proficiency in those called learned languages," being educated at the noted school of Blencoe in Cumberland, published at once an answer to this first printed attack, which may be partially quoted:

Besides, though he was not Master of all those Languages, It was no shameful Hypocrisie to put his Name to the said Book, it being much in English, wherein these Languages are interpreted. There are also John Stubbs and Benj. Furley's Names to it, as well as G F.'s, in the very Title Page, and they were Scholars. And G.F. was not so wholly Ignorant and Illiterate in all those Languages, as F.B. renders him; for he attained both to the Reading, Writing, and Understanding of Hebrew, and he might well fix his Name to the Book, both with respect to the matter treated on, the English, the Hebrew, and his care of Collecting the same, and yet not merit F. Bugg's Reproach of Cheating, Deceiving, Deceitful, Shameful, Hipocrisies, Juggles, feigned Miracles, out-doing the Papist's Legend . . .²⁷

²⁶ See the full article by Mary G Swift in *Jnl F H S* vi, 1909, 140ff., where are many more details of the controversy than are here reproduced. Still others could be added. Cf A N Brayshaw, *The Personality of George Fox*, 1933, pp 38f

²⁷ *Innocency against Envy in a Brief Examination of Francis Bugg's Two Invective Pamphlets against the People of God called Quakers*, etc. By G W. and S C. 1691, p. 15. The identity of S C. is uncertain, —perhaps Samuel Cater. The passage is cited not only by Mary G. Swift in this connection but also in *The Friend*, (Phila.), iv, 1830, p. 118, and thence in *The Miscellaneous Repository*, iv, 1831, p. 190. The

More recent examination of evidence, while it does not entirely confirm Whitehead's rather generous estimate of Fox's Hebrew learning, at least shows that such knowledge as he had did not come through any supernatural gift of languages, as Bugg says was claimed by the Quakers for him, but through the usual painful method of study. A fragment in manuscript carefully drawn has long been known, and is attested by the ancient antiquary Ralph Thoresby as "the Hebrew Alphabet writ by Geo. Fox the Proto-Quaker."²⁸ Typical of the quite rudimentary study of the language are the half dozen scraps which have come to light of Hebrew word lists, said to be in Fox's own hand, here the Hebrew being in English transliteration.²⁹ Among the books owned by Fox, listed after his death, were a Hebrew Bible, and a Hebrew Lexicon,³⁰ and a Hebrew grammar, and "another little Hebrew book."³¹ An unpublished lost book of Fox's described as

The Types, Figures and Shadows in the Old Testament fulfilled by Christ in the New: and many more precious things very serviceable to be printed which many are ignorant of. Written by G. F.'s own hand when he was in America. 1673.³²

title of Bugg's pamphlet, said to have been published the day before Fox died, was *Battering Rams against New Rome, containing a farther Discovery of the Grand Hypocrisie, of the Leaders and Teachers of the People called Quakers*

²⁸ Stowe MSS, 746, p. 139, in the British Museum. See *Jnl F. H. S* xv, 1918, 31, with plate, and the earlier literature there cited. A C Bickley, *George Fox*, p. 390, declares it unauthentic.

²⁹ Howarth MSS, 16, Portfolio 36-175 (two pieces at Friends Reference Library. See *Jnl F H S* xxi, 47), and other pieces. The Hebrew entries were arranged alphabetically. Probably all these are fragments cut up as souvenirs from a single list.

³⁰ *Jnl F H S* xxviii, 1931, 13, 16, editions not specified.

³¹ Unpublished memorandum at Friends Reference Library, London.

³² *The Annual Catalogue*, 12, 68F. This catalogue was made by Mark Swanner, and the Hebrew is well written. Swanner had had a year's theological study at Leipzig. There is much other evidence of Fox's interest in Old Testament names and customs. It has been supposed that the following obscure passage in Swarth. MSS vii 141, an undated holograph letter of Fox to Richard Richardson, is a request for a Jewish almanack: "i bid geret robards seand mee a olmeck of the iues."

evidently had on the title page a monogram like the following

גף גף
אלהים

The lower line is the Hebrew for "God," the upper Fox's own initials repeated. The same use of Hebrew for his initials is found in his own hand in the fly leaf of some books he once certainly owned,³³ and may account for the not infrequent inverted order of initials, F. G., which, though it has been used as a ground for assigning to others a rather too belligerent early pamphlet,³⁴ is nevertheless indubitably attested as a form of his signature in several of his papers, both printed and in manuscript.

Of the occurrence of Hebrew words in Quaker writings³⁵ no complete list could be easily compiled. They are, however, used sparingly and often the same ones over and over again. The original language was quoted most often of definitely controversial subjects in which Friends wished to emphasize their own position.³⁶ There was for example their position on Oaths. At his trial at Lancaster assizes in April 1664 Fox originally reported that refusing to swear he said:

It is for Christ's sake I stand, for it is *Lotish shabiun becoll daber*, and they all gazed and there was a great calm.³⁷

³³ For these books see *Jnl. F. H. S.* xxx. 1933, 16.

³⁴ M. E. Hirst, *The Quakers in Peace and War*, 1923, p. 120ff. Cf. *Bulletin of Friends' Historical Association*, xiii, 1924, 78ff.

³⁵ Contemporary religious pamphlets sometimes prefixed a brief Hebrew form of title on the title page. I can cite one Quaker example, *A Dreadful Alarm upon the Clouds of Heaven, mixed with Love*, by Henry Hingston. Exeter, 1703. There are Hebrew words also in the body of this book and at the end.

³⁶ Richard Davies, the Welsh Friend, when teased as a Quaker, replied, "There is English, Welsh, Latin, Greek and Hebrew for a Quaker" (*Journal*, as cited in *Quakeriana*, ii.12).

³⁷ This is *לא חשבועון בכל דבר* Camb. *Jnl.* ii.78, omitted in Ellwood's edition, 1694, p. 293, and later reprints.

This is not to be regarded as Fox's extempore improvisation in Hebrew as a rendering of the New Testament, "Thou shalt not swear by anything." "The Answer to Bishop Lancelot Andrew's Sermon concerning Sweaving," included in the contemporary pamphlet, *The Examination and Tryall of Margaret Fell and George Fox* (1664), quotes not only Matthew's proof text against swearing in the same Hebrew form as in the Journal of Fox, but also the similar text from the Epistle of James in Hebrew "since James probably wrote in it." Apologizing for the unpointed text the author continues "the Pricks, Points and Accents and the plain and naked interpretation of the Hebrew word we have left for them it most concerns to adde." There can be little doubt of the source of these retroversions into Hebrew. Allowing for the inevitable errors in typesetting,⁸⁸ the same words are to be found, "pricks" and all, in the first column of Hutter's convenient *Novum Testamentum Harmonicum* already mentioned.

Another passage published in 1659 by Fox, or at least by Fox and Burrough, in Hebrew, is at the end of *The Great Mistery of the Great Whore*. Though not there identified it is the same verse of Isaiah (ix. 6), a phrase of which became a topic of the later Quaker dispute with Roger Williams, as quoted above.⁸⁹

In several cases the early Friends are merely quoting reference works to support their argument. In arguing that honoring does not require "hat honor" Fox quotes a Greek-Hebrew-Latin dictionary with quotations from

⁸⁸ The Hebrew in early Quaker tracts is mostly inaccurate, but learned discussion on the topic is out of place (*Jnl. F. H. S.* xix, 1922, 138). Modern books quoting Hebrew are rarely impeccable and the difficulties of printers and Quaker authors and proof-readers in the Seventeenth Century can cause us no surprise. This is well illustrated in the Hebrew of the Battle-Door as John Stubbs' note might suggest (*ibid.* vi, 1919, 141, note 2).

⁸⁹ A paper of George Fox to the Pope (Swarth. MSS.vii.80) also has a few Hebrew words.

the Iliad and Odyssey for $\tau\acute{\omega}$ = חדר or $\tau\acute{\omega}$, *Honoro*, etc.⁴⁰ Or George Bishop,⁴¹ appealing to students of law to show from their own text books the Quaker doctrine of a principle of God in men, quotes from "Finch his book *Law*," Chap. i, page 2: "The Hebrews call it תורה (Thorah) from the Root ירה (Jarrah) which is to teach." At the end of the *New-England Fire-brand Quenched* is a series of "Testimonies concerning the Soul" from various writers including three: D. Fagius (in Gen. 2, 7), William Robertson (in his Key to the Hebr. Bible sub Lit. Nun), and Peter Martyr (in Psalm 94), which include the Hebrew words for soul, connecting them by a questionable etymology with the words for "heaven" and "breathe." We may wonder how men like Fox and Burnyeat acquired such information. Though we have evidence elsewhere of Fox's use of Robertson's Hebrew text books,⁴² the answer is probably that this reply to Roger Williams was prepared in the summer of 1677 while they were living at William Penn's home and had the company of other well educated men like Keith, Penington, and Barclay.⁴³

The Battle-Door was also a defense of a Quaker principle, the plain language of thou to one and you to many, and was an extraordinary tour de force from the printer's and the philologist's point of view as well. In the Hebrew as in every other section there was merely a summary of grammatical principles and rules as well as sentences from the Bible in the corresponding language. In each case no doubt the relevant works were drawn upon, grammars and versions of scripture. The burden of authorship and

⁴⁰ *Here You May See What Was the True Honour amongst the Jewes*, 1660, p. 2.

⁴¹ *A Tender Visitation of Love to both the Universities*, 1660, p. 12.

⁴² *Jnl F. H. S.* xxviii. 16; xxx. 11.

⁴³ *Short Journal*, p. 235.

of seeing through the press apparently fell upon John Stubbs, though the grammars, dictionaries and Bibles in many languages left in Furlly's library⁴⁴ suggest that later at least he possessed the best possible facilities for the undertaking.

For really sustained and uncontroversial use of Hebrew by a Friend our first example is from a later period, too late to be included in the present study, the self-made Hebraist Anthony Purver (1702-1777). This humble shoemaker was led first by noticing the mistranslations mentioned at the end of Fox's *Great Mystery* to study the Biblical languages and then to prepare a complete version of both Testaments which was published in 1764 under the patronage of Dr. John Fothergill. The rendering of the Hebrew is regarded by those who have tested it as particularly accurate and literal.

Though the Hebrew learning thus far mentioned was employed by Friends mainly to impress Christians, there are a few instances of Quaker writings in continuous Hebrew intended for the Jews. One is a single quarto sheet beginning, "O ye Jews the Messiah is come." Though it is unsigned and dated only in Hebrew it can be definitely attributed to Fox and to the year 1684 or 1685.⁴⁵ The place of imprint is Amsterdam. Another is a translation of Margaret Fell, *A Loving Salutation to the Seed of Abraham*. In a later edition of the last, published in London in 1660, Hebrew and English are printed in parallel columns, and as a concession to Jewish readers the book is arranged beginning in the back.

⁴⁴ *Bibliotheca Furliana*, Rotterdam, 1714.

⁴⁵ *Annual Catalogue*, 32G and 3.34H. Morris Birkbeck added this item in MS in his copy of Whiting's *Catalogue* (opposite p. 99) now at York "with 2d edition dated in 1659", and J. W. Rowntree in his copy of Smith's *Catalogue*, now at Woodbrooke (under Anonymous) entered the same item apparently as about 1660. But the Hebrew year חמ"ה is 1684 or 1685 of the Christian era. The only known copy is at Friends Reference Library, London.

Probably more use would have been made of Hebrew type by these zealous missionaries if they had not been discouraged by intelligent Quaker assistants in Holland and Germany where their missionary field principally lay. Evidently Latin and Dutch were also available media. One of Margaret Fell's books was circulated among the Jews in Holland first in Dutch. William Caton writes to her from Amsterdam:

Several books we have got dispersed in those parts in their own language which stirreth up some to ponder things a little more than they have done: of thine to the Jews there hath been seven or eight score of them delivered at their synagogue, some to the Rabbis and some to the Doctors, and I cannot understand that they have anything against it, but only they apprehend that the author doth judge that the Messiah is come already and they look for him yet to come.⁴⁶

A few months later he writes to her again:

The principle cause of my writing to thee is to give thee to understand that I have been with a Jew and have showed him thy book, and have asked him what language would be the fittest for them. He told me Portuguese or Hebrew for if it were in Hebrew they might understand it at Jerusalem or in almost any other place of the world. And he hath undertaken to translate it for us, he being expert in several languages.⁴⁷

Meanwhile Stubbs and Fisher were busy with Margaret Fell's books in England. John Stubbs writes to her from London:

Thy book called *The Second Call to the Seed of Israel* was awhile ago finished, and as he [Samuel Fisher] hath oppor-

⁴⁶ Caton MSS.III.(a volume lately acquired by Friends Reference Library, London; see *Jnl. F. H. S.* xxxii, 1935, 67f.) p. 38, dated 26.IV. 1657. The work may be her tract, *For Manasseh ben Israel, the Call of the Jews out of Babylon*. Smith says, "Translated by William Ames into Dutch, 1657."

⁴⁷ Caton MSS.III.p. 38 (second paginator), dated 18.IX.1657.

tunity he goes on in Hebrew with the first; it's difficult; also thy epistle, it is finished. I have them both in Latin. I intended to have them printed in one volume in Holland; to wit, the Hebrew copy, and the other two in Latin. . . . I desire thee to let me know whether thou wilt have the books printed and bound up in one or several. I can send to William Caton according to thy direction, but I put off till I hear from thee about them all.⁴⁸

The work was finished just before Caton left Holland in the spring of 1658, for he reports distributing one hundred seventy of them at Amsterdam "among the Jews, who willingly and greedily received them (they being in the Hebrew tongue)" and others "in Zealand, there being several Jews."⁴⁹

Yet when a few months later William Ames replies to George Fox's request to have his book to the Jews translated in Hebrew and printed he writes:

"I have been diligent and have gotten it translated into dutch because he who is toe translate it into hebrew Cannot understand english, and I have spoken with one who hath been a Jew toe translate it intoe hebrew, but since I have understood that the Common people of the Jews Can not speak hebrew but the greatest part Can speak high dutch and therefore I with som others according toe oure knowledge of the thing doe Iudge it would be of farr more service in high

⁴⁸ Abraham MSS 3, dated London, 4 VII 1657, printed quite inaccurately in M. Webb, *Fells of Swarthmoor Hall*, 2nd edit. 1867, p. 102. Cf *Jnl. F. H. S.* xi, 1914, 146. The text here is from a photostat. Smith mentions no Hebrew work of so early date, no Latin works by M. Fell, and dates her English "Call unto the Seed of Israel" about 1668, which is in any case too late for the imprint of Robert Wilson. Mrs. Webb's identifications seem to me uncertain. The Hebrew piece was apparently her *Loving Salutation* of which an edition is extant, issued I think in 1658. Was it translated by Fisher, or by the Amsterdam Jew? There is good evidence that Stubbs had to do with the English publication of her *Loving Salutation*, since we still have extant in Spence MSS.iii 38-40 on the back of a letter which she wrote to him in 1656 the original manuscript of "Certain Queries to the Teachers and Rabbis among the Jews" which was included in that pamphlet.

⁴⁹ Caton MSS.III p.40, dated London, 21.III.1658.

dutch then in hebrew, because it then would not only be of service for the Jewes but likewise to others . . . for if it be in hebrew they who can read it will not, and they who would Cannot." ⁵⁰

In 1661 William Caton writes to Margaret Fell:

Many of the Jewes have gotten of thy Hebrew bookes, when I was among them at Francford in their Synagogue I had of thine & of Penningtons which were in the Germane Language, but thine in Hebrew they had more mind to then the other.⁵¹

Isaac Penington wrote several pamphlets to the Jews.⁵² The one referred to above is probably *Some Considerations propounded to the Jews*. The German translation (also without date) *Einige Anmerckungen Vorgestollet an die Juden* ⁵³ included a letter of Samuel Fisher to the whole house of Jacob. The latter appeared separately in Dutch and also in Hebrew.⁵⁴

An interesting insight into the available translators into Hebrew of Friends' books is given in a letter endorsed by

⁵⁰ A. R. Barclay MSS. 6, dated Harlingen in Vriesland, 14.VIII.1658. See *Jnl F H S* xxvii (1930), p. 20

⁵¹ Swarthmore MSS 1.328, dated from Krisheim near Worms, 30 XI 1661. The same visit is reported in a letter to Friends of London of the same date (Besse, *Sufferings*, London, 1753, II.p.454), and in his *Journal*. In the latter he says, "I had also some books to dispose of among them, which for novelty's sake they coveted much after"

⁵² They are generally reprinted in the several editions of his collected works. Not all titles that seem so are really intended for the Jews. Like other Friends, Penington was fond of using "Jews" or "Israel" of the spiritual or Christian community.

⁵³ May we infer from William Caton's *Journal* that these had been printed in Hanau whither he had repaired for that purpose, having first failed to get them printed at Frankfort because of clerical censorship? An Italian translation of Penington's piece, though not listed in Smith's *Catalogue*, is extant at Friends Reference Library, Tract Vol. 133.

⁵⁴ See Smith's *Catalogue* 1616, with the query. The latter may now be removed since a Hebrew copy occurs in the volume mentioned in the preceding note, perhaps as appendix to Margaret Fell's *Loving Salutation* in Hebrew. For the next publication of a Friend's Book in Hebrew characters we may have to come down to 1912 when Allen C. Thomas's *History of the United States* was published in English and Yiddish.

George Fox as 1664 but written to him by John Stubbs, I think from London and shortly after the completion of the *Battle-Door* in 1660. He says:

I am going on with the other papers. I have felt something of getting thy book to the Jews printed in Hebrew. If Samuel [Fisher?] has as much time I believe it will lie upon him. Ben Furley if he would could do it as well as any I know. There is an old man talks of four pounds for doing it. I am like to get Margaret's [M. Fell] printed again with another character by a great teacher among the Jews which is come forth of Poland. He comes to meeting. [He?] writes himself Samuel Levi ben Asshur, a Jewish Rabbi &c. He wants employment and is very poor. He is very perfect in the Hebrew. He reads the Syriack Testament without pricks as readily I think as I do English.⁵⁵

Many of the works addressed to the Jews were printed only in English. English works were addressed to the Jews by John Perrot, *Immanuel, the Salvation of Israel* (1660), *Discoveries of the Day-Dawning to the Jewes* (1661, with the name John signed in Hebrew letters). At a later date William Penn provided an Appendix to the Jews in John Tomkins' *Harmony of the Old and New Testament* (1694).

Most extensive and in many ways most interesting were the writings of George Fox to the Jews. Several of them were according to his own words never printed in England.⁵⁶ But printed were *A Visitation to the Jewes from Them whom the Lord hath visited from on high* (1656),⁵⁷

⁵⁵ Crosfield MSS 7

⁵⁶ Does he imply that they were printed on the Continent? He writes of "notes that be written in Books or Lye in papers" of which "some are in Holland that have not been printed in England to ye Jews and professors" *Cambridge Journal*, 11 347

⁵⁷ A plan to translate Fox's *Visitation to the Jewes* into Italian is referred to in some abstracts of letters from John Perrot (Port. 17-76). Writing from Leghorn 17 VI. [1657], he relates how a French merchant named Origen took from the Friends a copy of this pamphlet to the Governor

A Declaration to the Jews for them to read over in which they may see that the Messiah is come (1661), *An Epistle to all Professors in New England, Germany and other parts of the called Christian World, also to Jews and Turks throughout the World* (1673), *A Looking Glass for the Jews* (1674). These were mostly reprinted in his collected doctrinal works; the last of them was translated by Jan Claus into Dutch and issued in Amsterdam in 1678.

The first decade of Quakerism was a period of much English interest in Judaism. Though the Jews were excluded from England they were tolerated in the liberal Netherlands close by and this example of toleration raised the question of admission to England. The leading Jewish figure at the time was the Rabbi at Amsterdam, a native of Lisbon, the learned Manasseh ben Israel (c. 1604–1657). His special attraction to Christians was his interest in Messianic prophecy. He believed that the Holy Land would not be restored to the Jews until they had spread in every inhabited part of the world, that the Messiah was soon to come, and that the North American Indians were the Lost Ten Tribes. The first of these beliefs explains his efforts for the admission of Jews into England, the second and third interested English Christians more generally. Many who entertained Messianic hopes were glad to have the authority of a learned Jew, but Friends and others argued from the Scriptures that the Christ had come, and that the other prophecies required that the Jews should first embrace Christianity. This was the subject of Fox's pamphlets. One of them, unfortunately not reprinted in his collected works, deals with the prophecy that wars should cease and provides

of the town and the latter said, "if there were nothing in it against the Pope he would have it translated and printed at Florence."

much the fullest statement of his pacifism that we have from his pen.⁵⁸

Other subjects of Manasseh ben Israel's works must have specially interested Keith and men of that kind,⁵⁹ but it was his idea⁶⁰ that the Indians were the lost ten tribes of Israel that remained longest a fascinating theory for the Quaker. From 1650 on many English discussions of the question were written agreeing or disagreeing with Manasseh.⁶¹ When the theory was accepted it was a special motive for trying to convert the Indians.⁶² Jewish Messianism and the interpretation of the apocalypses of Daniel or John were fields of vain speculation from which in general Friends were mercifully preserved, though some of their contemporaries were not so fortunate. Nor in the end did cabbalism have a direct, a wide, or a lasting in-

⁵⁸ *An Answer to the Arguments of the Jewes, in which they go about to prove that the Messiah is not come*, [1661], pp. 36-40.

⁵⁹ The favorite Hebrew phrase of Keith's, *nishmath hayyim*, is the title of Manasseh's Hebrew work on the immortality of the soul (Amsterdam, 1651).

⁶⁰ It was rather the idea of Antonio de Montesinos (Aaron Levi) who converted Manasseh to the theory. See *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, vii.283, 671. A similar theory had already existed for a century and continued down to Mormonism. See A. H. Godbey, *The Lost Tribes a Myth*, (Durham, N. C. 1930), pp. 2ff.

⁶¹ From the year 1650,—the year in which Manasseh's *Hope of the Jews* was issued in Spanish, Latin and English,—I quote two London titles, viz., *An Epistle to the Learned Manasseh ben Israel*, by Edward Spencer, a member of parliament, and *Jewes in America, or Probabilities that the Americans are of that Race*, etc., by Thomas Thorowgood, B.D., "one of the Assembly of Divines."

⁶² The theory was held for example by Spanish missionaries like Garcia and Puritans like John Eliot, the apostle to the Indians, not to mention other Christians of all stripes. See for example Jonathan Edwards, *Observations on the language of the Muhhekaneew Indians: in which . . . some instances of analogy between that and the Hebrew are pointed out* (New Haven, 1787). Samuel Mather, *An Attempt to shew, that America must be known to the Ancients* (Boston, 1773). A Philadelphia Friend contemporary with these writers and agreeing with them in this view was Charles Crawford. In 1784 he republished Fox's pamphlet *A Looking Glass for the Jews*, contributing a preface, and he wrote an *Essay on the Propagation of the Gospel in which there are Numerous Facts and Arguments, Adduced to prove that many of the Indians in America are descended from the Ten Tribes* (Philadelphia, 1799; Second Edition, 1801).

fluence in the Society. We may, therefore, count it a rather harmless legacy from Jewish lore if several Friends, and, at one time, even William Penn himself,⁶³ played with the current fancy that the natives of America were descended from the Chosen People.

The publication of Quaker addresses to the Jews began with the year 1655 when Manasseh ben Israel came to England in person to attempt to secure religious freedom.⁶⁴ One of the first must be the broadside, *A Bosome opened to the Jews: Holding forth to others Some Reasons for our receivng of them into our Nation*, by William Tomlinson.⁶⁵ Margaret Fell's address to Manasseh and other works were printed in 1656 and later. Though he failed to secure formal permission the Jews were tacitly readmitted.

There is little evidence that Friends had direct contact with any of his race in England. Part of Bugg's comment on the *Battle Door* suggests that "Eighty Pounds of mill'd money had been paid by Gerard Roberts besides a Dozen Bottles of Wine given by M. Fell to hire some Jew to assist G. Fox in preparing the Hebrew Portion of the *Battle-Door*."⁶⁶

⁶³ *A letter from William Penn . . . to the Free Society of Traders*, 1683, Sect. xxvi (also reprinted in his works) "For their original, I am ready to believe them of the Jewish Race, I mean, of the Stock of the Ten Tribes."

⁶⁴ This visit was the occasion of *Light for the Jews*, written by Arise Evans, a sectary often associated with Friends.

⁶⁵ Tomlinson's tract is not in Smith's *Catalogue*, nor do I know of copies in Quaker libraries. The *Catalogue of the Thomason Tracts* dates it in 1652, but the original which I have consulted in the British Museum has the imprint "LONDON: Printed for Giles Calvert, at the Black-spread-Eagle, at the West end of Pauls 1656," in which the final 6 has been crossed off to read 1655 and Thomason's own endorsement in hand is January 12, 1655. George Thomason dates Margaret Fell's address to Manasseh ben Israel Feb. 20, 1656. Her *Loving Salutation* bears imprint of 1656, but Thomason dates his copy Oct. 31, 1657, and I have seen copies on whose title page 1656 has been changed by an early hand to read 1657. This is the date assigned it in her collected works, 1710.

⁶⁶ Cf. *Jnl. F. H. S.* vi. 1909, 141. So Cotton Mather, *Magnalia* ii, 527. John Whiting in answering Mather does not deny the Jewish assistance,

In 1670 George Whitehead penned a paper "For the Jews who assemble in Bevers Marks, London," which was published in 1674 as part of George Fox's *A Looking Glass for the Jews*.

In the next year at John Pennyman's extravagant wedding in the Merchant Taylor's Hall, London,—an event described in advance by Ellis Hooke as "a madd frolick acted by our apostatized Apostle John Penniman who intends to wedd Mary Boreman"—one of the criticisms was that he invited not only most of the Aldermen of the city and all sorts of ranters, but "the whole synogogue of the Jews."⁶⁷

It was on the continent that Jews had their fullest freedom and largest influence and there Quaker visitors most often came upon them. The first Friends who came to Holland met them, and later visitors like Penn and Fox in 1677 mention them in their Journals. It is true Fox says he was refused a conference with them at Amsterdam. Instead on 8 m. 16 and 17 he prepared a paper to them.⁶⁸ If it was published I do not identify it; but of another book, probably *Looking Glass to the Jews*, he wrote early in 1679 to William Penn: "Robert Barclay writes that they have printed my little book to the Jews in Holland in Dutch, and have dispersed them among the Jews, and since several of the Jews come to Friends Meetings."⁶⁹ At Friedrichstadt Fox "had a discourse with a Levite that was a Jew, and he was much confounded in all that he said, and was loving and I went to his house (where there

but asks, "And what if a Jew was hired to help in some part of that work, was that any crime?" *Truth and Innocency Defended*, 1702 (re-print of 1885, p. 481).

⁶⁷ Swarth. MSS i. 57. But the phrase may be figurative (taken from Revelation ii 9) since in the same context is mentioned the feast of "Robert Rich's of the Seven Churches whereto Jezebel [cf. Rev. ii. 20] Giles Calvert's wife was invited."

⁶⁸ *Short Journal*, 254.

⁶⁹ *Annual Catalogue*, 7,38G. Apparently the whole letter is not extant.

was a Jew an Israelite and his family) and he shewed me the Talmud and many other books." ⁷⁰

In the long story of Quaker visits to Holland frequent references occur to Amsterdam Jews and to their synagogue.⁷¹ William Caton says in 1656, "I was also at the Jews Synagogue at Amsterdam and later had service in one of their houses." ⁷² His fellow missionary William Ames writes a year later to Margaret Fell, "There is a Jew at Amsterdam that by the Jews is cast out (as he himself and others sayeth). I gave orders that one of the Dutch copies of thy book should be given him." ⁷³ About thirty years later Thomas Wilson when in the same city with Peter Fearon had a long public discussion in the synagogue.⁷⁴

An interesting evidence of the kind of assistance that Friends hoped to secure for the Quaker propaganda in England appears from the following letter of Thomas Lawson to Margaret Fell:

Thomas Killam was telling me his wife hath got one of the books mentioned to thee called the Testament of the Patriarchs. He saith it speaks very much of Enoch's prophecy which hints much against the lying priests. It rose in me to speak to thee if any Friend were moved to go to Holland and had any conference with the Jews that they made inquiry of them if Enoch's writings be extant among them.⁷⁵

⁷⁰ *Short Journal*, 240. This discourse also was once in writing (*Annual Catalogue*, 4, 103G).

⁷¹ In this field also expectation of the forthcoming monographs on Dutch Quakerism by William I. Hull justifies me in citing here only a few instances of Quaker contact with Jews in Holland.

⁷² *A Journal of the Life of . . . Will. Caton*, 1689, reprinted in *Friends Library*, Vol. ix, 1845, p. 452.

⁷³ Swarth. MSS. iv.28 (Transcripts i.73).

⁷⁴ *Journals of the Lives, Travels and Gospel Labors of Thomas Wilson and James Dickinson*, London, 1847, p. 116. The date is not given, but it was probably about 1688 to 1690.

⁷⁵ Swarth. MSS. i.243 (Transcripts i.719), dated Bordley Hall, 11. i. 1657.

Unfortunately for Lawson, Enoch's prophecy was not to become known to Europeans (whether Jews or Christians) for over a century and a half when the translation of the Book of Enoch was found in an Ethiopic MS and published in English, Ethiopic and other languages.⁷⁶ The early Quaker interest here exemplified in the apocrypha and other Biblical data rejected by the churches is characteristic and was doubtless one of the things that gave them an interest in Hebraica and Judaica and a sense almost of sympathy with the Jews.

The less frequent early visitors to Italy also made contacts with the Jews there, and it may be supposed from several contexts that the ambition of certain Friends to reach Jerusalem was due to the desire to preach to the Jews in their ancient capital, as well as to convert the Turk.⁷⁷

In Venice John Stubbs and Samuel Fisher⁷⁸ bore "witness among persons of all nations, religions and profes-

⁷⁶ The *editio princeps* of the Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch was published by R. Lawrence in 1838. He had published a translation of it into English in 1821. The other apocryphon, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, from whose references Thomas Lawson inferred the existence of Enoch, had been known in England for some time. Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, made a Latin translation in the early Thirteenth Century from which an English translation was published in 1581. Among many later editions one was made I believe by the Quaker publisher of Philadelphia and New York, William Bradford (1663-1752).

⁷⁷ Though I am not aware of any early Quaker publication in Arabic, except the section in the *Battle-Door*, it is not impossible that the enterprising First Publishers provided themselves with suitable printed ammunition for the Turks as well as for the Jews. In 1661 Stubbs and Fell at Alexandria, en route as they hoped to China and Prester John's country, are reported by the English consul at Cairo to have "thrown pamphlets about the streets in Hebrew, Arabick and Latin." Besse, *Sufferings*, II.420.

⁷⁸ It was presumably this journey to the Mediterranean to which John Stubbs looks forward in the letter already cited (above note 48). Samuel Fisher was not ready to go then (September, 1657), and did not expect to be able to go "till about that time they call Michaelmas." Meanwhile, writes Stubbs, "he will not let it be known unto me that he sees any clearness of going with me, but tells me he knows not but something may be upon him to the Jews of Amsterdam in Holland."

sions . . . but especially the Jews who," they report, "though zealous of their circumcision yet deny not the light in the conscience to be the chief teacher without obedience to which all outward observations avail not, nor yet deny us access to speak as freely as we can desire both in their synagogues & elsewhere but rather desire discourse with us, loving us not a little in that they see us against the Popish superstitions, fopperies and images. With some of them we have daily discourse upon the 'Change as we are made to meet them, who delight to hear of any hopes of an admission for them to live in England which might tend much to the conversion of some among them if such a thing might come to pass." ⁷⁹

In Rome they report there were five thousand Jews "among whom by their invitation they had borne their testimony to the truth both privately as they had invited them, also publickly in the open schools where they heard them preach, and of all people which they came amongst in the several cities where they were abiding between Amsterdam and that place they found them most ready to receive the truth so far as to an assent with desire to hear more." ⁸⁰

There is, however, no evidence that Jews embraced Quakerism or were influenced by it or even mentioned it in their writings.⁸¹ The Jewish historians whom I have consulted agree with this verdict,⁸² though it is just possible

⁷⁹ Letter at Friends Reference Library, London (Port. 17-76), dated Venice, 18.IV.1658.

⁸⁰ Abstract of letter from Samuel Fisher and John Stubbs to several Friends at Kent, dated Rome, 7.VI.1659 (*ibid.* Port. 17-77).

⁸¹ *The Complaint of the Children of Israel*, by Solomon Abrabanel of the House of David (7th Edit., London, 1736), sometimes found in Quaker collections as an attack against tithes congenial to the Quaker spirit, was really written under a pseudonym by a Christian, William Arnall. Quite different is the anonymous *Chronicle of Nathan ben Saddi*, published in 1758 in Pennsylvania by a rabid opponent of the Quaker party in current politics.

⁸² Professor Alexander Marx, Librarian of the Jewish Theological

that undiscovered Quaker references could be found in the voluminous writings of Manasseh ben Israel. The argument from Scriptures that the Messiah had come evidently left them cold. In his loving and appreciative correspondence with Margaret Fell William Caton suggests as early as 1657 another reason:

As touching the Jews it is no marvel if thou (with whom the secrets of the Lord are) be sensible of something among them, for I believe there is a spark in many of their bosoms, which in process of time may kindle to a burning flame. I have understood that there are some among them that would willingly become Christians, but that they fear intolerable persecution and that from their brethren who are of the same stock and root of their forefathers . . .⁸³

A conversion in the opposite direction at least from a later period may be cited. Warder Cresson (1798–1860),⁸⁴ a birthright Philadelphia Friend, became a conspicuous proselyte to the Jewish faith. His change took place through the influence of his friendship with Isaac Leeser of the Mikveh Israel synagogue. He assumed the name Michael C. Boaz Israel. He became the first American consul to Jerusalem and died there in 1860.

Seminary in America, New York City, and J. S. da Silva Rosa, Librarian of the Portuguese Israelite Seminarium at Amsterdam.

⁸³ Caton MSS III.p.35, dated Schiedam in Holland, 5.IV.1657. The passage becomes partly illegible at the end. See also the case of an individual Jew mentioned above, p. 160.

⁸⁴ See *The Key of David*, etc., by Warder Cresson, Philadelphia, 5612 [i.e. 1852], especially "Lunacy Case, or the Great Lawsuit for becoming a Jew," pp. 203–244. The paper entitled "The Quaker Turned Jew" (Smith, *Anti-Quakeriana*, p. 18) answered by Ellis Hooke about 1675 is hardly serious history.

Latin Works of Friends

Anna Cox Brinton

VII

LATIN WORKS OF FRIENDS

INTRODUCTION

The Society of Friends found "the heavenly food which gives contentment" not in literature, language, and logic, but, as Robert Barclay expresses it, "from the inward teachings and instructions of the Spirit . . . learning by a living experience." Yet Quakers did not refuse words and reason for setting forth their doctrine.

In seventeenth century Europe, Latin was still a living tongue for living needs and qualified linguists filled an essential if often an anonymous office in broadcasting the message of early Friends in Europe and the Levant. They even aspired to reach the farther Orient. John Stubbs, William Sewell, and several others translated for George Fox. Barclay and Penn composed their own Latin treatises and epistles. In Quaker circles Latin was not used for exposition by the learned to the learned as such. Yet because our "early publishers of Truth" were at pains to reach all men, scholars could not be omitted. On the side of worldly counsels Friends were at no time unaware that the conviction of articulate, well-trained, and influential persons was an earnest of future success. After the middle of the eighteenth century Latin died out as a Quaker vernacular and became a tool of scholarship.

Our Latinity can be classified under several heads: The first category contains one book, Barclay's *Apologia*, which stands in a class by itself. It is the only full-sized volume written and published first in Latin. Second are treatises first printed in English but later translated into Latin to give them a wider public. George Fox's *Spiritual or*

Heavenly Salutation to all the Tender-hearted in Christendom (*Spiritualis necnon Divina Salutatio*) may be cited as an example. Epistles or familiar letters form a third and very large group. The Latin correspondence of Penn and Sewell is an important instance. Quaker scientists, following the current fashion of the eighteenth century, used Latin for their printed works on medical, botanical, and geological subjects. With these may be grouped grammatical texts by Quaker schoolmasters and editions of classical authors prepared for the training of youth. A fifth type includes English versions of Latin works prepared and published by Friends. Of these a translation of Emanuel Swedenborg's *Treatise concerning Heaven and Hell* by the potter William Cookworthy of Plymouth is a curious example. Under the sixth and last heading fall miscellaneous items—Latin sermons, anecdotes, diaries, conversations, verses, titles, and incidental phrases that reward antiquarian curiosity.

Since it has not been practicable to consider all examples of uses of the Latin tongue by Friends typical compositions must suffice as illustrations.

BARCLAY'S *Apologia*

Robert Barclay's (1648–1690) *Theologiae vere Christianae Apologia* (1676) outrivals all other Quaker Latinity both in its excellence and in its influence. Its publication brought the Quaker message into the open where it was vociferously debated in many tongues. *Anti-Barclaiio, id est Examen Apologiae quam non ita pridem Robertus Barclaius Scoto-Britannus pro Theologia, vere Christiana edidit* appeared in Hamburg in 1683. This *Anti-Barclaius* called forth *Vindiciae quorundam Robert Barclaii Noematum*, (1693) by Edmund Elys, sometime Fellow in Balliol College, Oxford. Joseph Smith informs us that

Elys "does not appear ever to have joined the Society" though he wrote in vindication of Friends. Other writings of similar import appeared elsewhere.

Two years before the publication of the *Apology* Barclay issued a preliminary statement entitled *Theses Theologicae, Omnibus cuiusque generis totius Christiani orbis clericis* (1674). The Theses were first printed as a folio broadside from the press of Christophorus Cunradus of Amsterdam. They were especially directed "to doctors, professors, and students of theology in the universities of Europe, (sive Pontificiis sive Protestantibus)." The fifteen *Theses* are the fifteen "Propositions" of the *Apology*. Jacob Claus, also of Amsterdam, published the *Apology's* editio princeps, a quarto of some four hundred pages with an "Index Rerum Praecipuarum." Barclay was still in his twenties when he wrote these impressive and important statements of Christian doctrine.

An autobiographical bit in his tract entitled "Universal Love Considered and Established upon its Right Foundation" describes young Robert's precocity. "From my very childhood," he says, "I was very ambitious of knowledge and by a certain felicity of understanding . . . I was successful beyond my equals in age." Willem Sewell (1653-1720) bears testimony to the same traits in *The History of the Rise, Increase, and Progress of the Christian People Called Quakers*. Barclay, he says, "was trained up in literature having lived some years with his uncle at Paris where the Papists were very active to bring him over to their religion." It is to be noted that this was prior to the boy's sixteenth birthday. Sewell continues, "he was so skillful in school learning that he was able to encounter the learned with their own weapons."

Barclay's Latin style is easy, fluent, and vivid. Its lineage is traceable to Jerome through the Western Fathers and

the Scholastic tradition rather than through Bembo to the Romans or direct to Cicero.

The familiar passage in Proposition xi. 7, "When I came into the silent assemblies of God's people" appears thus in the original:

Quando in silentes Dei populi conventiones veni, secretam vim senserim inter eos, qua tactum est cor meum, et, prout excessi, malum in me debilitari, bonum autem suscitari observaverim.

In one of his prefaces Barclay confesses that he acts "not here the grammarian or the orator, but the Christian;" he goes on to say, "neither have I sought to accomodate this my work to itching ears, who desire rather to comprehend in their heads the sublime notions of truth, than to embrace it in their hearts." Yet the form of expression is adequate to the depth and seriousness of the theme, and the treatise deserved its several reprintings in the original Latin, its numerous English editions, and its translation into German, Dutch, French, Spanish, Danish, and Arabic "for the information of strangers."

TREATISES TRANSLATED INTO LATIN

This is a large group of comparatively small tracts, catechisms, and minor compositions translated into Latin to serve a European need. George Fox's *Catechism for children* (1657), "that they may come to learn of Christ the Light, the Truth, the Way that leads to know the Father, the God of all Truth," was printed in London in Latin with the title, *Catechismus pro Parvulis* (1660) by Robert Wilson, "*apud officinam ejus ad Aquilam nigram in Martin le Grand.*" When written in English the address of this shop was "at the sign of the Black Spread-eagle and Windmil" variations hard to reproduce in Latin.

The more widely used catechism by Barclay was reprinted twenty or more times in England and America. It appeared in Rotterdam in Latin in 1676. An *Editio secunda*, "priore multo emendatior," bears the date, London 1727. From the dialogue under section v, "Concerning the Light (*De Luce, qua Jesus Christus omnem hominem illuminavit*)" I quote one query and answer:

Question: Do good men love (the Light) and follow it?

Answer: He that doth truth comes to the Light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God.

In Latin:

Q. *Num boni amant Lucem et sequuntur illam?*

R.: *Qui vero dat Operam veritati, venit ad Lucem, ut manifesta fiant opera ipsius, quod secundum Deum facta.*

Meanwhile many of George Fox's doctrinal tracts, particularly those which were addressed to a universal public were appearing in Latin. For his world-wide audience he required a super-national tongue. The first essay in the collected "Doctrinals," "To all who would know the way of the kingdom whether they be in forms, without forms, or got above forms, "was given forth" in Latin in 1660¹; another is directed "for all people throughout all Christendom to read over, (*ut omnes per totum Christianismum legant*)," 1662. Another is sent "To all magistrates and rulers in the whole world who profess Christ," (*Omnibus magistratibus, gubernatoribus universo mundo qui*

¹ Cunctis, Viam in Regnum, Noscere Desiderantibus, sint vel in Formis extra Formas, vel omnibus Formis Superiores, Admonitio

Mentes vestras ut introrsum, ubi vox Domini (quem quasi remotum, inscianter adoratis) audienda est, invertatis, illumque ibi vera pro Sapientia expectare. Veritatem ab errore, verbum a litera, potentiam a forma, veros denique, a falsis, Prophetas ut possitis decernere. Ab illis Edita, quos mundus Trementes, contemptim denominatur. Authore Georgio Fox.

profitentur Christum) (1656). There is also an undated appeal "To all Kings, Queens, Dukes, Earls, Lords, and Nobles of the Earth," (*Omnibus vel ullis illorum in Mundo Regibus*). "The Pearl found in England" of which the title page goes on to say, "This is for the poor distressed scattered ones in Foreign Nations, From the Royal Seed of God and Heirs of Salvation, called Quakers, who are the Church of the Living God, built up of Living Stones in England," (1660) received the following Latin title page,

Margarita in Anglia reperta pro pauperibus, afflictis, et dispersis in Gentibus exteris a regali semine dei et Salvationis haeredibus quos dictitant Quascos qui sunt ecclesia Dei viventis coaedificati ex vivis lapidibus in Anglia.

Its exordium is simple and impressive:

Margareta in agro absconditur et ager est mundus et mundus est in corde vestro.

The awkward noun, Quaker, here rendered "Quascos," which can never be accommodated to any European tongue, is dealt with variously by translators. At the end of George Fox's letter to the Grand Cham we find, "*A Populo Dei in Anglia, vocato Anglice Quakers,*" as also in an address to the King of Poland, "*propter innocentes afflictos et opressos homines, qui, per contumeliam Quakers vocantur*" (1684). Elsewhere we read:

Principia quaedam illius Electi a Deo Populi Ironice Nominati Quakers ut omnes per totum Christianismum legant . . . exhibita per Georgium Fox, Londini MDCLXXI.

On a broadside the signature appears, "*Georgius Fox Britannus, unus eorum qui illusorie Quakeri dicuntur.*" In a reply by George Keith to an anonymous Jesuit the

phrase occurs, "*eos per ludibrium Quakeros dictos.*" "*Robertus Barclaius Domini Dei Servus et ex eis unus qui ironice Quakeri dicuntur*" is the signature appended to the *Theses Theologicae*.

Willem Sewell is our best informant as to the distribution of the Latin tracts. His *History* contains many items such as this dated Dunkirk 1659, "The next day Burrough wrote some queries to the friars and nuns in and about that town which were sent to them in Latin." A pamphlet by Burrough, "*Annunciatio Omnibus Regibus et Principibus et Gubernatoribus, in Christianismo*" (1659) is listed in Smith's Catalogue. Sewell tells us that—"E. Burrough wrote also some propositions to the Jesuits, priests and friars wherein he particularly represented the tyranny of the Church of Rome in true colors; and these propositions were sent to them in Latin." (1660) "About this time Samuel Fisher and John Stubbs were also in Rome where they spoke with some of the cardinals . . . They also spread some books [doubtless in Latin] amongst the friars." (1662) "Daniel Baker . . . delivered a paper written in the Spanish tongue to the Governor and inhabitants of Gibraltar with some Latin books." One entry, more explicit than the rest, occurs in the annals of the year 1664, as a conclusion to an account of the activities of George Fox. "But before I part with him," says the indefatigable Sewell, "I must mention, that some time before, he had written several papers to the emperor, the kings of France and Spain, and also to the Pope. These writings were by somebody else turned into Latin, and so given out in print. In these he levelled chiefly against persecution for religion's sake." In 1676 Keith and Barclay present "A Brief and Distinct Solution of the Argument . . . That Not the Inward Revelation of the Holy Spirit, but the Outward by the Scripture is the principal

rule . . . at least to us Europeans who have the Scriptures." An apologetic postscript to this tract has been preserved, "As to the Latin we have not been very curious in this writing by reason of haste."

An early tract on simplicity was written by Willem Sewell himself. It was printed in Amsterdam in Latin and Dutch (1715) with the double title, *Oratio in Luxum* and *Vertoog tegen de Ooerdand*.

In 1725 Benjamin Holme (1683-1749) wrote a fifty-eight page epitome of Quaker doctrine which he entitled a "Serious Call in Christian Love to all People to turn to the Spirit of Christ in themselves." Few Friends' books have had a more immediate success. Holme wrote in the preface:

This treatise being small may come into many hands where some larger books . . . may not come . . . and may have the good effect to remove prejudice . . . If the Reader desires a more full and particular account of our principles, there is an Apology written by Robert Barclay which has been printed in English, Latin, High and Low Dutch, French, Spanish, and Danish, to which he is referred.

Holme's "Serious Call" was itself translated not only into Latin, but into German, French, Dutch, and Welsh as well. The Latin edition is called *Adhortatio Pathetica, Ex Amore Christiano proveniens; qua omnes ad Christi Spiritum in Semetipsis relucentem diriguntur*. It was translated by William Massey, schoolmaster of Wandsworth in Surrey. Massey was the author of a number of odd treatises, among them, *Pietas Promota, sive Collectio novissima verba multorum illius sectae qui apud Anglos vulgo Quakeri appellantur*, (1737), an adaptation of the English work, intended to be used as a reader for boys and for the information of foreigners, "*jam vero in usum*

Peregrinorum et studiosae Juventutis latine reddita. Interprete Gulielmo Massey, 1737." A few of the chapter headings are:

De Georgio Foxo
De Edvardo Burrough
De Richardo Hubberthorn
De Stephano Crisp
De Roberto Barclao
De Springetto Penn

The chapter "De Maria Mollineux" is particularly entertaining. Of her linguistic attainments Massey says, "*In litteris adeo profecit, ut Linguam Latinam calleret et copiose loqui posset; graece quoque haud parum fuit erudita.*" Her cousin, Frances Ridge Owen, edited *Fruits of Retirement* (1702), a slender volume from the pen of Mary Mollineux. Some Latin stanzas "Englished by Henry Mollineux, her husband" are included. In the preface of this little book, Frances Owen tells us that:

Mary Mollineux was much afflicted with weak eyes, which made her unfit for the usual employment of girls and being of a large natural capacity, her father brought her up to more learning than is commonly bestowed on our sex.

Her husband says she spoke Latin on her death bed. Latin titles of English works by William Massey are *Musa Paraenetica* (The Admonitory Muse), *Synopsis Sacerrima*, and *Humanae Vitae Oeconomia*.

Another literary curiosity is a poem by Richard Claridge (1649-1723), long a clergyman of the Church of England, who joined the Society of Friends and became a prolific expounder of its doctrines. The brochure is entitled: "*A spiritual Poem on Christian Counsel to Youth formerly composed and publish'd in English by Richard Claridge.*"

Carmen Spirituale Monita Christiana In Usum Juventutis Continens Olim a Richard Claridge Anglice Compositum et editum Nunc Latine versum a J. B. (Joseph Besse), Londini: imprimuntur prostantque venalia ab assignatis J. Soule, 1728." I quote the opening distich.

*Sit Deus ipse Timor Vester: quae jussit, agatis
Hoc Hominis totum continet officium.*

There are fourteen stanzas of four couplets each, rendered line for line. This is followed by twenty-six hexameters "*Meditationes Matutinae et Verspertinae*," following which the *Carmen Spirituale* is 'construed' after this fashion:

Sit Deus, ipse let God himself be *Timor vester* your fear *agatis* do ye *quae* the things which *jussit* he hath commanded *Hoc* this *continet* contains *totum Officium* the whole Duty *Homini* of man.

Joseph Besse, author of *The Sufferings of the people called Quakers* was Claridge's admiring friend and biographer.

In *The Fells of Swarthmore Hall*, Maria Webb quotes a letter which John Stubbs wrote to Margaret Fell, Seventh month fourth, 1657:

Thy book 'The Second Call to the Seed of Israel' was awhile ago finished . . . also thy epistle it is finished. I have them both in Latin. I intend to have them printed in one volume in Holland, to wit, the Hebrew copy, and the other two in Latin.

EPISTLES AND FAMILIAR LETTERS

This is a large class including many rare items, both published and unpublished. Epistles are not always easy to distinguish from doctrinal tracts. Letters are here defined as personal communications on matters of imme-

diate importance. Tracts are more general and theoretical.

Maria Webb's book contains another pertinent observation that has to do with Thomas Lawson, friend and neighbor of the Swarthmoor household, to whom many of the sons of the gentry in those parts were intrusted for instruction in languages and botany. He was a distinguished herbalist and well trained linguist. His eldest daughter Ruth shared her father's interests, "several of her letters written in Latin are still extant."

We are indebted to Sewell for further details about Latin letters. "This year," (1676) he informs us, "Robert Barclay writ a letter (in Latin) to the Herr Adrien Paets . . . concerning 'the Inward and Immediate Revelation of the Spirit of God'." Having been "sent from Scotland to Holland it was delivered by Benjamin Furly at Rotterdam to the said Heer Paets . . ." Robert Barclay several years later translated this letter into English, in which tongue it appears in the English translation of Sewell's *History*.

In 1677 William Penn came to Embden. Sewell notes that "he went to speak with the Burgermaster André at his house and askt him if he and the Senate had not received a letter in Latin from an Englishman about two years since concerning their severity towards the People called Quakers? The Burgermaster said, He had. William Penn then replied, 'I am that man and I am constrained in conscience to visit thee on their behalf, etc.' The Burgermaster deported himself with more kindness than was expected and gave some faint hope of alteration."

In 1678 Robert Barclay wrote an epistle in Latin to the ambassadors of the king of France and those of the United Netherlands to exhort them "to treat about a general peace." "The epistle," continues Sewell, "together with his Apology for the true Christian Divinity, in Latin was

delivered to each of the said ambassadors viz. a book for every one of them and one for their principals. George Fox also wrote an exhortatory epistle to them which, being translated and printed in Latin, was also sent to them, and before this year came to an end, the peace was concluded."

The recent biography, *Willem Sewell of Amsterdam*, 1933, by William I. Hull contains a delightful and informing chapter (IV) on Latin correspondence. Sewell's letters to William Penn, to various men of letters, to a few learned ladies, and to friends and foes of Quakerism are vividly translated. Graphic or pungent phrases, parenthetically carried over from the original, add zest to the English rendering. The chapter (V) on Gerard Croese's *Historia Quakeriana* includes letters no less interesting, as do also other parts of the book.

During the latter decades of the seventeenth century George Fox was writing to high and low over the whole earth. In 1660 he addresses "the Emperor of China and his subordinate Kings and Princes, (*Pro Imperatore Chinesi ac omnibus ejus regibus ac principibus subordinatis*)."

The letter begins:

Amici,

Potestas est supra omnes potestates, et haec potestas quotidie se manifestat et manifestabit in dies, atque Deus est.

He also writes "To the Turk and all that are under his Supream, to read this over which concerns their Salvation," (*Turcae et omnibus sub ejus ditione*) and "to the magistrates of the Isle of Milita," (*Scriptunculae Quaedam Anglico-Latinae Magistratibus de Insula Maltensi*).

George Keith was a prolific writer in English and a ready linguist. In addition to a tract or two in Latin I have seen citations of a Latin letter to Gerard Croese. This, according to Joseph Smith, was published in translation in

1696. John Richardson (1666–1753) narrates in his journal, (Friends Library IV, 88) a characteristic episode in the controversialist's explosive career. Already separated from the Society of Friends, and passionately eager to bring the Quakers to his point of view, George Keith had come to Lynn, Massachusetts, at the time of a monthly meeting. Richardson told the people, many of whom were newly convinced, to be "swift to hear but slow to speak for George Keith hath a life in argument." Sitting on his horse Keith cried out, "Is here a man that is a scholar? Is here a man that understands the languages amongst you? If so I will dispute with him." "I told him," writes John Richardson, "it was probable the English tongue was most generally understood and used amongst that people, and therefore I thought it was the best to keep to it."

This episode recalls the title of a tract by Edmund Gearle and others of Hampshire, "Three Countrey-men's English answers to the Clergymen's Latine Charges. Or the Lay-men's plain English, in answer to the unknown language of the pretended Spiritual Court at Winton." (1664) Joseph Smith cannot forbear to note nor can I, that the author of this piece lies buried at Lower Wallop.

SCIENTIFIC LATIN

The famous Quaker doctors Fothergill (1712–1780), Lettsom (1745–1815), and Rutty (1698–1775), wrote in Latin. Their *dissertationes medicae* were intended for perusal by scientific men at home and abroad. Physicians of less note like Thomas Knowles (1772), John Simms (1774), William Woodville (1775), Robert Willan (1789), Thomas Young (1796), Thomas Hancock (1806), and Ashby Smith (1820) published in Latin. As time went on a decreasing number of researches appeared

in Latin, but the language was retained as a cryptic medium to preserve the "mystery" of their prescriptions. *Hippodonomia*, *Podophthora*, and *Pharmacopeeia Equina* are titles used by Bracy Clark, a notable veterinary surgeon of London in the early nineteenth century.

James Logan (1674-1751), Secretary of the Province of Pennsylvania, wrote *Experiments on the Indian Corn, or Maize of America*, with his observations arising therefrom on the generation of plants, (*Experimenta Meletemata de plantarum generatione*), which was published in Latin at Leyden in 1739. This botanical study was republished in London, with an English version by Dr. John Fothergill on alternate pages. An undated mathematical study, "*Canonum pro inveniendis refractionum, tum simplicium, tum in lentibus duplicium focus, demonstrationes geometricae*," also bears Logan's name.

In the huge array of Quaker books there are a few writings which can be properly classed as philology or grammar. First in date and by far the most curious is *A Battle-Door for Teachers and Professors to learn Singular & Plural; you to Many & Thou to One . . . wherein is shewed forth . . . how several Nations & People have made a Distinction between Singular & Plural*. More than fifty languages are drawn upon to support the argument. This fantastic excursus, printed in folio and bearing the names of George Fox, John Stubs (sic) and Benjamin Furly was printed for Robert Wilson in 1660. The second section, occupying six pages, is entitled the "Latine Battle-Door." At the foot of its opening page George Fox's name is appended to the exhortation which appears each time in a different tongue at the outset of each linguistic Battle-door, the English, the Italian, the Greek, the Hebrew, the Chaldean, and so on. In the Latin it runs:

In lucem qua Christus vos illuminavit in eam credite, ut unctionem intra vos, ad vos docendum cognoscatis.

George Fox's signature in this connection prompted a tirade by Gerard Croese, the Latin historian and critic of Quakerism. Croese's spiteful comment roused the loyal Sewell to rejoin (1661):

now though Ger. Croese doth disapprove in G. Fox, that he put his name to this book as well as J. Stubbs and B. Furley, yet I do not think it so improper as the said author doth; for G. Fox was a great promoter of that work; and though he was not skilled in languages, and some were for calling him an idiot or a fool, yet I know him to have been a man of good understanding, and of deep judgment.

George Fox cooperated in producing several textbooks, among them a booklet for children in the writing of which Ellis Hooke had a share. Christopher Taylor adapted this production to classroom use as a beginner's Latin book. He calls it, "*Institutiones Pietatis in quibus Saluberrima vitae praecepta et aliae res notatu dignissimae continentur.*" "*Primum a G.F. et E.H. Anglice editae, nunc autem in usum Christianae Juventutis scholasticae Latine redditae.* Instructions of Godliness, In which the most Wholesome Precepts of Life and other things worthy to be noted, are contained . . . for the use of Christian youth at School. The Chief principles of the Latin tongue being added That young beginners may also learn and exercise the Declension and conjugations (so called) with the rules of construction most necessary to be known. 1676." This as well as Thomas Huntley's *Grammar of the Latin Tongue in which the four principal parts of Grammar, Orthography, Analogy, Syntax and Prosody are distinctly treated of* (circa 1792), and John Hodgkin's *Sketch of Latin Grammar* (circa 1838) were both written and used by Quaker schoolmasters.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

When William Penn sojourned in Holland in 1677 with George Fox he visited a society of the Labadites.

At parting, [we are told in Sewell's chronicle] one of the pastors asked him if the truth rose not first amongst a poor, illiterate and simple sort of people. "Yes," answered William Penn, "and it is our comfort that we owe it not to the learning of this world." To which the pastor returned, "Then let not the learning of this world be used to defend that which the Spirit of God hath brought forth; for scholars now coming among you will be apt to mix school learning amongst your simpler and purer language and thereby obscure the brightness of your testimony." W. Penn having answered to the purpose took his leave.

It would be interesting to know what Penn said.

George Fox's uncompromising attitude is clearly shown in another page from Sewell:

Passing through Northumberland, and Bishoprick, he came to Durham, where was a man come down from London, to set up a college there, to make ministers of Christ, as they said. G. Fox entering into discourse with this man, said that to teach men Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, and the seven arts, was not the way to make them ministers of Christ; for the languages began at Babel; and to the Greeks that spake Greek as their mother tongue, the preaching of the cross of Christ was foolishness; and to the Jews that spake Hebrew as their mother tongue, Christ was a stumbling block. And as for the Romans, who spake Latin, they persecuted the Christians; . . . "Dost thou think," said G. Fox to the man, "to make ministers of Christ by these natural confused languages, which sprang from Babel, are admired in Babylon, and set atop of Christ, the life, by a persecutor?" The man, puzzled a little by this, confessed to many things spoken of by G. Fox. Then it was shown him further, that Christ made his ministers himself, and gave gifts unto them, and bid them pray to the Lord of the harvest, to send forth laborers: . . . This discourse

had such effect upon the man, that he became very loving; and having considered the matter further, he never set up his intended college.

Yet with all this dread of the interference of worldly knowledge in the work of the ministry, Friends made use of "tongues" on numerous occasions. A pertinent example is the case of William Caton (1636-1665):²

When I was at Rotterdam . . . I was much straightened for want of an interpreter; but there being one that could speak some Latin, I spoke some time in that language to him, and he interpreted it to the rest.

The Journal of William Reckitt (1706-1769)³ describes a surprising linguistic experience. En route to America on the ship *Lydia* he was captured by a roving French vessel.

One evening as we were sitting in the cabin a Frenchman who seemed a very zealous young man for their way told them we (Quakers) were a strange people; we both disowned baptism and the Lord's supper. Their discourse was in Latin and though I am not a Latin scholar, I understood so much that I gathered the purport of their discourse.

William Reckitt then explained that baptism and the Lord's supper were spiritual, and feeling "pretty easy" he left them.

Christine Majolier Alsop (1805-1879) describing her early life in England in the home of William Allen (1770-1843) whose life was one of continual engagements says that he rose early and lighted his own fire. The early hours were generally devoted to his correspondence and during the time he was shaving his daughter used to read to him in Latin from Livy.

² Friends' Library IX:452.

³ Friends' Library IX:50.

Extracts from the *Journal and Letters* of Hannah Chapman Backhouse (1787–1850) who later performed arduous labors in the work of the ministry, contain this childish entry:

March 11, 1803—Resolved to be industrious, and get up in the morning, and knock Latin into me, as almost every other hour in the week is employed.

This is followed by the entry, "A capital lesson in mathematics."

The memoirs of Joseph John Gurney (1788–1847) by Joseph Bevan Braithwaite contain juvenilia in Latin written at the age of fifteen, to his sister Louisa describing a day's program. Early morning studies and breakfast are touched upon in these lines:

*Cum primum Phoebus dispergit lumina grata,
Assiduus surgo; recipit me bibliotheca;
Lectito, vel scribo; cerebrum geometrica vexant.
Sobria post haec solantur jentacula fessum;
Butyrum panisque novus cum lacte recenti.*

An episode in the new world concerns the botanist John Bartram (1699–1777):

While plowing, [says his son] his inquisitive eye and mind were frequently exercised in the contemplation of vegetables, . . . their generation, the progress of their growth and the various stages of their maturity and perfection.

Bartram went to Philadelphia and while there, as he writes:

though I knew not what book to call for I ingenuously told the bookseller my errand, who provided me with such as he thought best and a Latin grammar beside. Next I applied to a neighboring schoolmaster who, in three months, taught me Latin enough to understand Linnaeus.

Later, through Peter Collinson of London, John Bartram's correspondence extended to all the distinguished naturalists of his time.

David Ferris (1707-1779), an approved minister of the Society of Friends in Philadelphia, tells us in his memoirs:

I wrote a short account of the fore part of my life in Latin, continued to about the twenty-fifth year of my age. The many difficulties and dangers in my way and sometimes doubting whether I should hold out to the end, induced me to keep my history in a language unknown to those about me. I concluded that if I should hold on my way, I might afterward translate it into English and add to it as I found freedom. And now after about twenty years' experience of divine support and preservation, having great cause to say that "God is good to them who seek him" that none seek him in vain, and that his tender mercies fail not, I am inclined to translate it, hoping it may be useful, at least, to some of my posterity.

To some Friends the study of Latin appeared as a form of "creaturely activity" not actuated by the highest of motives. The *Memoirs* of Samuel M. Janney (1801-1880) of Virginia contain this autobiographical information:

About this period (before 1824) I felt a desire to become distinguished for learning and indulged in aspiration for literary fame. In order to assist me in the attainment of these ends I commenced the study of the Latin Grammar. Before I had made much progress my mind was brought under religious exercise; I wished to scrutinize the motives by which I was actuated; and finding them not pure, nor, as I believed, consistent with the Divine will, I renounced the study. Since that time I have reflected much upon the subject of the Ancient Classics and although I have felt my deficiency in that branch of learning I cannot say that I have ever repented of the decision then made.

A few Latin titles of works by Friends are worth quoting. A tract signed P.H. is called, *Tumulus Decimarum or the history of tythes from their nativity to this present day of their expected Ruine and Dounfal*, London, 1659. *The Snake in the Grass*, a notorious tirade against the Quakers, was answered in 1699 by Joseph Wyeth in a book called *Anguis Flagellatus or A switch for the snake*, etc.

The Keithian controversy called forth at least two polemics with Latin titles: *Proteus Redivivus or the Turner of Turner's Hall truly represented*, (London: 1700) by Daniel Phillips and *Proteus Ecclesiasticus or George Keith varied in Fundamentals . . . with remarks on Daniel Leeds' abusive almanac for the year 1703 by way of post-script* (Philadelphia: 1703 or 4). In 1773 Thomas Letchworth wrote *Multum in parvo, Contra parvum in Multo, or a six days candid review of a six years uncandid controversy*. Thomas Hancock of Nottingham, not a Friend, devised the most generally known Latin Quaker title; this was *The Peculium: an endeavor to throw Light on some of the causes of the decline of the Society of Friends, especially in regard to its original claim of being the Peculiar people of God*.

In conclusion it may be observed that Quaker writing as a whole has been a means rather than an end. A few perfect utterances like Nayler's dying words or Thomas Story's prayer rise above the didactic level. Barclay and Penington occasionally speak the "inevitable word," but in the main our books undertake a teaching mission. Seldom are they keys into magical places; at their best they serve as a door to the sanctuary. The Latin works of Friends are not better than their English "Doctrinals," and "Doctrinals" in any tongue are pedagogic.

Much that has been cited and quoted in this essay is

pedestrian; George Fox would have labeled some of it "whimsey." The stream of Latin composition rushed like a freshet for the early "Publishers of Truth." In the eighteenth century it quieted down. In the nineteenth only shallow pools appeared, and by the twentieth it had dried up altogether. But the old-time Latin books and pamphlets still lie in our repositories. An occasional reader turns their pages surprised to find there an authentic call to search the soul's depths or a vivid and compelling thought recorded in a language once world-wide and enriched by centuries of Christian use.

The Mennonites and the Quakers of Holland

William I. Hull

VIII

THE MENNONITES AND THE QUAKERS OF HOLLAND

RELIGIOUS TOLERATION AND SECTS IN HOLLAND

For nearly three generations before the advent of the English Quakers in Holland, there had been a physical, economic, intellectual and religious rapprochement between the Dutch and English peoples. The latter owed very much in many ways to their progressive Dutch neighbors. When they fell into commercial rivalry and warfare with each other, during the seventeenth century, English writers cast many undeserved aspersions upon their "enemies" in the Netherlands; and even the religious toleration in Holland called forth ridicule and denunciation of "the great Bog of Europe."

For example, an English author of 1670 remarks: ¹ "If the people dye in perdition, they are so low that they have a shorter cut to Hell than the rest of their Neighbors, and for this cause perhaps all strange Religions throng thither, as naturally inclining towards their center."

Contemporary Dutch authors themselves admit and denounce this multiplicity of heretical sects. One of them, the author of a guide-book published in Amsterdam in 1700, after mentioning the English and Mennonite churches among the "sights" of that city, adds the comment: ² "Besides those congregations, whose churches we have briefly described, there are various other separate Sects which hold their meetings in secret (*verborgend*),

¹ Owen Felltham: *A Brief Character of the Low Countries under the States—*, London, 1670.

² *Reys-Boek*, p. 85.

namely, the Socinians, the Quakers and other monstrosities (*Misgeboorten*), to which we really cannot give a name. And what wonder that in such a great city, amidst the throng of hundreds of thousands of people, there should lurk a hodge-podge of deformities (*mengelmoes van Wanschepelen*)?"

It was precisely because of these scores of heresies and almost two score rival sects in Holland that it appeared to offer to the English Quakers a fertile soil for the sowing of their seed. Among these religious societies, the Menonites, or *Doopsgezinden*, were regarded by the sowers of Quakerism as especially hopeful proselytes. For they not only resembled the Quakers in some important particulars, but they have been regarded by some students as the precursors of George Fox, the representatives of a Quakerism which was older than the Quakers themselves.

THE BAPTISTS AND THE QUAKERS IN ENGLAND

Some historians of Quakerism have sought to trace its origins back to the religious sects which sprang up in England during the course of the Protestant and Puritan Revolutions in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. They have shown that *indirectly* and perhaps *unconsciously* the founders of Quakerism owed much to some of these sects, and especially to the Baptists. One of them, William Tallack, a Quaker author of 1868, goes so far as to regard them as the *direct* ancestors of Quakerism. He declares: ³ "Both divisions of the Baptists [the General

³ William Tallack: *George Fox, the Friends, and the Early Baptists*, London, 1868, pp. 39-40, 65-88, 159-167. Tallack states in his Preface "This work is, it is believed, the first which has definitely and minutely traced the doctrines and constitution of Quakerism mainly to the early Baptists." On pp. 39-40 of his book, he says: "The non-originality of much of the Quaker system has been slightly alluded to in the valuable and suggestive introduction to a memoir of George Fox, written (it is understood) by Thomas Evans (of Philadelphia) and his brother William. These authors have, to some extent, acknowledged the influence of the

and the Particular] had anticipated most of the doctrines, and also the system of discipline, adopted by George Fox and the Friends. But it was the General Baptists, (who were a distinct body as early as 1608), that had most fully arrived at the views and usages which have been subsequently attributed to Quaker origin. The differences of opinion which arose amongst the Baptists (relative to election and reprobation) about the time of the Civil Wars, resulted in many thousands joining the ranks of Fox and the Friends. Fox was rather the *organiser or completing agent*, than the founder of Quakerism."

William Tallack devotes many pages of his book to showing the resemblances between the Quakers and the General Baptists, and concludes that, "altogether the resemblance, or often the identity, of the Quaker institutes with those of the Baptists is so complete that the Society of Friends may truly be termed an offspring of the Baptist denomination. George Fox appears to have long and carefully studied the doctrine and discipline of that godly people, and to have largely gathered the constitution of Quakerism from this source. But it is extraordinary that so very little, if any, acknowledgment of the same has been made by himself, or by his successors, hitherto."

Later historians of Quakerism, while recognizing the resemblances between the English Quakers and Baptists, and acknowledging the points of contact and indirect

Baptists on the subsequent development of the Quaker theology; but the extent of that influence is shown by contemporary records to have been much more considerable than even the Evanses represent it as being."

William and Thomas Evans, referred to above, published their *Memoir of George Fox and their own Introductory Remarks in the Friends' Library*, Philadelphia, Vol I, 1837, pp. 3-108. They refer to the rise of "the Society of Baptists or Anabaptists" in England, in the sixteenth century [sic], and mention some of the similarities between the English Baptists and the Quakers; but they do not directly connect the two sects, nor do they suggest any connection of the Quakers with the Anabaptists of the Continent or the Mennonites of Holland.

influence of one upon the other, attach much less importance to the debt of the early Quakers for their origin to the Baptists. William C. Braithwaite, for example,⁴ says that "the points of contact between the early Baptists and the early Friends are indeed numerous"; and he shows that in one instance at least, a "shattered" or separatist society of Baptists at Mansfield followed George Fox, in 1648, and formed the first congregation of "Children of the Light," or Quakers.

But Rufus M. Jones, in his Introduction to Braithwaite's book,⁵ concludes that "it is not yet, and probably will not ever be, possible to prove that George Fox and the other leaders of this special movement [Quakerism] *consciously* adopted their ideas and methods, their peculiar testimonies and form of organization from the Separatist sects which swarmed about them, and which were the product of many centuries of striving after an inward way to God."

In his Introduction to George Fox's Journal,⁶ Dr. Jones speaks of the Baptists as "the first sect to touch the life of George Fox;" but after speaking of various other contemporary sects, he concludes: "The person of genius discovers in the great mass of things about him just that which is vital and essential. He seizes the eternal in the temporal, and all that he borrows he fuses with creative power into a new whole. This creative power belonged to George Fox. There was hardly a single truth in the Quaker message which had not been held by some one of the many sects of the time. He saw the spiritual and the eternal element which was almost lost in the chaos of half-truths and errors. In his message, these scattered truths and ideas were fused into a new whole and received new life from his living central idea."

⁴ *Beginnings of Quakerism*, 1912, pp. 12, 43-45.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. XXV.

⁶ *George Fox: an Autobiography*, Philadelphia, 1904, pp. 18, 23-24.

THE BAPTISTS AND THE MENNONITES

Robert Barclay, a nineteenth century descendant of Barclay the Apologist, in his scholarly treatise on "The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth,"⁷ devotes five of his chapters (II, III, VII, VIII and IX) to the sects in England prior to 1640, and three chapters (IV, V and VI, with an Appendix to VI) to the rise of the Baptists in Holland and England and of the Mennonites on the Continent. He comes to the conclusion that the General Baptists and the Friends were "to a very large extent united in matters of doctrine, practice, and discipline; even in minute particulars the correspondence is very striking;"⁸ and, taking one step farther and linking up the General Baptists of England with the Mennonites of Holland, he declares⁹ that the first Baptist (non-immersionist) Church formed in London "coincided in all the views of the Waterlander Mennonites, signed the confession of the celebrated Hans de Rys, joined the Church of Lubbert Gerrits, and were accepted as *members* by the Mennonites as soon as they resided in Holland (without baptism or any ceremony whatever); and that the Baptist Churches in England corresponded with the Mennonite Churches in Holland, and agreed to refer their differences to the decision of the latter."¹⁰

Barclay therefore concludes that "the first Arminian [General] Baptist Churches in England were really Mennonite"; and also that "so closely do these views [of the General Baptists] correspond with those of George Fox, that we are compelled to view him as the unconscious

⁷ London, 1876.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 223.

⁹ Pp. 72-73.

¹⁰ Following Evans's "Baptists," he states that by 1626 there were Churches corresponding with the Waterlander Mennonites of Amsterdam in London, Lincoln, Sarum, Coventry, and Tiverton.

exponent of the doctrine, practice, and discipline of the ancient and stricter party of the Dutch Mennonites [the Waterlanders].”¹¹ Even some of the *differences* between the General Baptists and the Friends, Barclay traces to a controversy among the Waterlander Mennonites of Amsterdam. This controversy arose in 1624 over the respective values of the Bible and the Inner Light, one party of the Mennonites (followed by the Friends) accepting the views of Caspar Schwenkfeld in regard to the Inner Light and the outward sacraments.¹²

“Does not all this clearly show,” Barclay concludes, “the way in which the ‘Doctrine of the Light,’ associated with the doctrines and practices of the Mennonites, passed into England, and found a powerful and active exponent in George Fox?” In answer to this question, Barclay admits that “it is possible that Fox was unconscious of the source of these ideas. Yet we can hardly suppose the close connection of religious observances and details of Church structure, with doctrines which were new in England and old in Holland, to have been the result of chance, or a simple result of the study of the New Testament, perfectly uninfluenced by human agency.”

THE MENNONITES AND THE QUAKERS

Following up such significant facts and conjectures, as the above, the writer of this chapter went to Holland and England in 1907-08 to discover if possible actual links connecting the origins of Quakerism in England with the Mennonites of Holland. The result of his researches led him to believe that there was no *direct*, personal or hereditary connection of predecessor and successor between them.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 73, 77.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 227-248.

Rufus M. Jones, in his admirable *Studies in Mystical Religion*,¹³ devotes two of his chapters to the story and interpretation of Anabaptism on the Continent and in England. Of the movement as a whole, he says that "it gathered up the gains of earlier movements, and it is the spiritual soil out of which all non-conformist sects have sprung." In his *Spiritual Reformers in the 16th and 17th Centuries*,¹⁴ Dr. Jones traces a close "parallelism" between the early English Quakers and the Mennonites and their offshoot, the Collegiants, of Holland, and comments upon one of the latter's books (*The Light on the Candlestick*) as being "indistinguishable in its body of ideas from Quaker teaching." But although he sees in these and other spiritual reformers the spiritual precursors of the Quakers, he finds no direct connecting links between them and the founder and organization of Quakerism.

MENNONITE CONVERTS TO QUAKERISM

It is abundantly clear, however, from the history of Dutch Quakerism, that the founders of Quakerism in Holland sought to draw the large community of the Mennonites into the Quaker fold. This famous religious society, which had already played a memorable rôle in Dutch history and was destined to fill a large one in Amsterdam's and Holland's future, was divided (like the Baptists of England) into several sects at the time of Quakerism's advent, and each of these sects was still further weakened by internal dissensions. These circumstances, as well as the similarities in doctrine and practice between the two societies, led the Quaker missionaries to turn with great eagerness and confidence toward the making of Mennonite converts. Their attempts to proselyte them

¹³ First edition, London and New York, 1909; 1923 edition, pp. 369-427.

¹⁴ London, 1914, p. 123.

began with William Ames in 1656, and lasted until Jean Etienne Mollet and William Allen in 1840.

Ames, before becoming a Friend, had been a Baptist minister, and Willem Sewel even calls him a *Doopsgezind Leeraar*. He was therefore considered especially fitted to make a successful appeal to the Doopsgezinden, or Mennonites, of Amsterdam. His first appeal to them was indeed successful, if not in the number, at least in the quality, of his converts. Among these were the parents of Willem Sewel, namely, Jacob Willemszoon Seewel, a surgeon of Amsterdam, and his wife, Judith Zinspenning, the latter of whom became a highly esteemed author and minister among both Dutch and English Friends. Associated with these outstanding converts of Ames in Amsterdam, were Robert Tibbels, Abraham Deurhof, Marritje Willems, and Willem Ryswyk. During his six years of service on the Continent, Ames extended his search for converts among the Mennonites to various other towns and cities of the Netherlands, especially to Leyden, Rotterdam and Utrecht, and up the Rhine Valley as far as the Palatinate, through northern Germany as far as Hamburg, and even into distant Poland. The Mennonites of these places, even of Poland, he calls "baptists," and says of the Polish ones that "they are a very wicked people, notwithstanding their profession, . . . and are much like unto the Irish people"—among whom also he had labored.

William Caton came to the aid of Ames in 1657 and during his eight years of missionary work on the Continent, he too pursued the Mennonites, his work among them being chiefly in Leyden, Utrecht, Zutphen, the Palatinate, and the Frisian towns of Dokkum, Makkum, and Workum. Illustrative of the usual way in which the Quaker missionaries approached the Mennonites, are Caton's accounts of his and Ames's visit to Zutphen in 1657, and of his own

efforts in Dokkum and Makkum in 1661. Of the first of these, he says:

I went with my dear brother William Ames through some of the principal cities in Gilderland; howbeit our movings were especially to a place called Zutphen, a city out of which W. A. had been banished before: and when we came there we went to the meeting-place of the Mennonists, (otherwise Baptists); but when we would have gone in, they bolted the door to us, and would not suffer us to enter in among them: and William being pretty well known in the city, the rude multitude gathered about us; but to avoid the occasion of a tumult, we withdrew out of the streets to the walls of the city, and very many people followed us. As we were moved and allowed of God, so we spoke in his power, to the making known of his eternal truth; and a very good opportunity we had thereunto upon the walls of the city, from which we withdrew when we were free; howbeit, the baser sort of people were very rude in throwing stones and clods at us; but the Lord did so preserve us, that we received little harm thereby. In the afternoon there came very many people to us out of the city to our lodging, where we had also a very good opportunity to declare the everlasting truth freely among them, and to disperse many books in their own language, which we had brought along with us; and several there were that received pretty good satisfaction. My dear companion had proposed to have staid there some time, but the magistrates being moved with envy, would not suffer the people to entertain him; besides they took it as a great presumption in him, that he should dare to return again thither, after he was banished from thence. Moreover, they threatened that if the Baptists [Mennonites] came at us they should be served in like manner; which threatnings, together with what they had done before, did keep the people much in fear and slavery, so that they durst not appear to vindicate that which they were convinced of. After we had such good service there, and in those parts, I returned again to Amsterdam—

Of his attempts in Friesland, he says:

In due time, through mercy, we ¹⁵ arrived well upon a First-day in the morning, at a place called Dockham, where we went into the meeting of Doopsgesinds, (i.e. Baptists so called,) which was indeed very large. When he that spoke had done, I stood up and began to declare the everlasting truth in their own language; but they were much divided among themselves, for some would gladly have heard me, others would not suffer me; but one of the chiefest of their teachers was very moderate, and spoke to this purpose, that if I had a nearer way to God to declare, than that which they knew, or one that was more excellent than theirs, they would willingly hear me. And in order thereunto many of them came together in the afternoon, and heard me declare that way which I preferred before theirs, and affirmed it to be nearer to God, and more excellent than theirs; and little they had at that time to object against it. Before we parted they were so far satisfied, that by their great silence (in which they sat as if they had been Friends,) they seemed not to have anything further to object. After the meeting was done, the aforesaid teacher invited us to his house, and to take up our lodging there, which (for several reasons,) we were free to accept of. When we got to his house at night, many people followed us, so that we had a very good meeting in his house that night. And when we had continued there some time in very good service, we left that place and returned to Leewarden—

In Makkum, Caton's experience was as follows:

We passed to a place called Mackham, where there were also many of the aforesaid Doopsgesinds, and there we were entertained by an old man, who had been a preacher among them for many years. When the First-day came, it was upon us to go to their place of worship, which accordingly we did; and there we waited until he that was speaking was done: afterwards I began to speak, but he would not suffer me, (to wit, he that had preached), but became presently very angry, though the people would gladly have heard me; but he would not suffer them; and he became finally so uncivil, that he put the people out of the meeting-place with his own hands; at

¹⁵ Caton and Pieter Hendricks of Amsterdam.

which some being much offended, a skipper or master of a vessel, stood up and said, *Wilt ghy hem alhier niet toelaeten om te spreecken; dan sall hy tot mynents spreecken*; that is, If they would not suffer me to speak there, then I should speak at his house, where afterwards we had a pretty good meeting, and such as had desires to hear the truth (which the aforesaid angry man would not suffer me to declare in their meeting-place) those came thither, so that some very good service I had there for the Lord.

The example of Ames and Caton in striving for converts from the Mennonites was followed by numerous other "Friends travelling in the ministry" from England and America, and by the Dutch Quaker leaders as well. Steven Crisp (on fourteen visits between the years 1663 and 1685); George Fox (in 1677 and 1684); William Penn (in 1677 and 1686); Roger Haydock (in 1681, 1686, and 1695-6); Roger Longworth (on five visits between 1676 and 1685); John Bell (in 1709); Sarah Collier (about 1710); John Padley (in 1715); Margaret Langdale (in 1717); Benjamin Holme (in 1714 and 1723); Mary Wyatt and Mary Farmer (in 1725); Elizabeth Jacob (in 1729); Catherine Phillips, Sophia Hume, and John Kendall (in 1757); John Eliot, Isaac Sharpless, John Kendall, William Fry, and James Backhouse (in 1770); Robert and Sarah Grubb and Mary Dudley (in 1788); William and Elizabeth Allen, Elizabeth Robson, and Elizabeth Fry (in 1816); Thomas Shillitoe (in 1821 and 1825); William Allen and Elizabeth Fry, Samuel and Elizabeth Gurney (in 1840): these were among the two score Quaker preachers from England who, on their visits to the Netherlands were ever mindful and hopeful of Mennonite converts.

From America, too, came Thomas Chalkley (in 1709), Thomas Story (in 1725), Susanna Morris (in 1729), John Churchman (in 1753), John Pemberton (in 1753 and 1782), George and Sarah Dillwyn (in 1788), and Stephen

Grellet (with William Allen, in 1832), all intent upon harvesting a crop of converts from the Mennonite fields. After a journey of 1000 miles in Holland and Germany, Chalkley exclaimed: "I know not that I ever met with more tenderness and openness in people, than in those parts. There is a great people which they call Mennonists, who are very near to Truth, and the fields are white unto harvest among divers of that people, spiritually speaking. Oh! that faithful labourers not a few might be sent of God Almighty into the great vineyard of the world, is what my soul and spirit breathes to him for."

Human hands have often builded better than their owners knew; and it is part of the pathos of Chalkley's labors that, coming though he did from Philadelphia, he had no conception that "the great vineyard of the world," so far as many of the "open and tender Mennonites" were concerned, was not Holland and Germany, but his own Province of Pennsylvania. In the very year of his visit, the great tide of Germans, among whom were many Mennonites, set in towards the land of Penn. William Penn, too, who had championed religious toleration in Germany and preached Quakerism there and in the Netherlands, was doomed to disappointment so far as the triumph of either toleration or Quakerism on the Continent was concerned; but how little did he dream that his efforts there were to prepare the way for some hundreds of Dutch Quakers and many thousands of German Mennonites and allied sects to participate in his "Holy Experiment" beyond the Atlantic, where both religious toleration and Quakerism were to be securely rooted. For a quarter of a century before 1709 the Mennonites of the Netherlands had advanced considerable sums of money to enable the Mennonites of Switzerland and the Palatinate to escape from their oppressors by removing to Pennsylvania. The

cruel devastation of the Palatinate by the soldiers of Louis XIV in 1688, and the militarism of its native rulers who had no sympathy with "religious scruples against bearing arms," had made that blighted land no longer a land of promise for the peace-loving Mennonites and Quakers; while in Switzerland, though political freedom—in some of its aspects—"sat proudly on its heights," genuine religious liberty, with its rightful corollaries, was still far from its dawn. Hence we find that in 1709 both Mennonites and Quakers of the Old World assisted their persecuted brethren of the Rhine-land to escape to the New. The London Yearly Meeting in that year appropriated the sum of £50 to aid the Mennonites, who had fled from Switzerland to the Palatinate, to remove thence to Pennsylvania.

Thomas Story was particularly impressed by the opportunity among the Mennonites of the Netherlands, and made a long journey among them, holding Quaker meetings in a full score of their towns, and usually in their own meeting-houses. He mingled with and preached to them—especially against outward baptism, which was his *bête noire*—in the large cities of Amsterdam and Rotterdam; but it was particularly in his three months' journey through the towns and rural districts of Friesland that he sought for Mennonite converts.

At Dokkum, the meeting was held in the house of the Mennists, who were fearful of persecution, however, and were unwilling to give public notice of it. At Drachten, Story's party, and Mary Wyatt and Mary Farmer, ten years later, held large meetings in the Mennonites' house. At Leer, the Dutch Reformed clergy had accused the Mennonites and Quakers of having brought down the punishment of wars and plagues. The Mennonites of Gorredijk loaned their meeting-house and were "loving and pleased."

In Groningen, a new sect of Mennonites—"that sort who wear their beards like the German Jews"—were angled for. At Grouw, some Mennonite opponents raised a hymn, but were frowned down by the others, and their minister was particularly gracious and hospitable. In Haarlem, a Quakeress had married a Mennonite, who attended with many others of his congregation the Quakers' meetings, and was "much affected." Meetings, "open and fresh," were held in the Mennonite houses in Heerenveen, Hoorn, Joure, Leeuwarden, Makkum, and Oudeboone, and most of those present were Mennonites. At Holwerd, the Mennonites responded to the Quaker sermons by raising a hymn (the 75th Psalm), and were warned to interpret the words spiritually. At Molkwerum, the Mennonites were busy with the funeral of one of their leaders and could not lend their meeting-house or attend to the Quakers. As late as 1782, John Pemberton failed to hold meetings in the meeting-houses of the Mennonites, but sought after them in their homes, schools, and even orphan asylums.

The English and American Quaker ministers were accompanied in their visits among the Mennonites by Dutch Quakers who were both interpreters and preachers, or otherwise useful though silent members of the Quaker fold. Among them were Jan and Jacob Claus, Judith Zinspenning and Willem Sewel, Pieter and Elisabeth Hendricks, Gertrud Deriks, Pieter Leenderts, Barent van Tongeren, Willem Tick, Barend, Cornelis, Jan and Deborah Roelofs, Jakob van Buylaert, Willem Koenes, Jacob Nordyke, Heyn Jansen Grootewal, Herman and Abraham Roosen, Reyner Jansen, Jacob Telner, Adriaan Gerritsz, Lenart Arents and several of the Krefeld and Krisheim groups of Friends, a baker's dozen of the Boekenooogen family, Jan Jansen Rijers, Ede Jans, Brucht Taekes, Maria

Weyts, Jacob Arentsz, Dirk Meschert, Dirk Meindersee, Hans Jansen of Twisk, Jan Willems Vlaschboom, Cornelis Olyslager, Hans Peter Umstat, Hendrik and Jacob Vander-smissen, Jan, Jan Roelofs, Jan II, Richard and Sophia Vanderwerf, Sijmon Jansz and Maria Weyts Vettekeuken.

Most of these appear to have been Mennonites before they became Quakers, and some of them Mennonite preachers. The story of their respective lives and services to Quakerism in the Netherlands is a rich and varied one, but far too lengthy to be entered upon here. Some of them were pillars of support, during many years and through long and deep tribulation, of the Society of Friends in Holland. Some of them suffered fines, imprisonment and death for their faith.

MENNONITE AND QUAKER CONTROVERSIES

It was only in the later, weaker years of Quakerism in Holland that a mutual friendship between the Friends and the Mennonites grew up and flourished. In the earlier years, when the Mennonites were losing many of their members to the Quaker meetings, a stern and long continued pamphlet warfare was carried on between their respective leaders. Those who participated most actively in this controversy on the Quaker side were William Ames, William Caton, Steven Crisp, John Higgins, George Fox, Judith Zinspenning, Pieter Hendricks, Jan Roelofsz, and Benjamin Furly; and on the Mennonite side, were Pieter Joosten (de Volder), Jacob Jansz, Galenus Abrahamsz, David Spruyt, Petrus Serrarius, Barend Joosten Stol, Frans Kuyper, Jacob Adriaensz, and Adam Boreel.

From the biting and prolific pen of Ames came fifteen pamphlets aimed at the Mennonites alone! As he lingered on his death-bed in Amsterdam, he was told that it was being rumored among his old opponents, the Mennonites

and Collegiants, that he had altered his opinion of them, and was grieved at having judged them wrongfully. He thereupon roused himself to declare that this was untrue; that he still judged their way of worship, especially their disputations and will-worship, to be out of the way of the Lord. "In this belief," Sewel writes, "he died in peace." But even after death his enemies pursued him. At his funeral, which occurred on the same day as William Caton's wedding, Caton says:

Though we went as wisely to work as we could to prevent a Tumult, yet nevertheless on a sudden the rude People were gathered together, and became so tumultuous that without pretty much difficulty we could not get through them with the Corps, which finally was laid in the Ground; and afterwards the Multitude was very rude, and Friends were pretty much abused; howbeit, through mercy we were all preserved.

MENNONITE AND QUAKER PERSECUTION

It would be unjust to attribute this post-mortem violence to Ames's Mennonite foes alone; indeed the Mennonites were themselves subjected to false accusations and to much clerical and secular persecution. One reason for this persecution was due to a common belief that the Mennonites were themselves the feared and hated Quakers in disguise. The Dutch Reformed clergy kept insisting that Socinians and Quakers were living among and corrupting the Mennonites, and kept demanding that the Provincial States and States General should take drastic measures to purge the Mennonite congregations of these heretics.¹⁶

A typical complaint of this kind comes from a clerical pamphlet (by Rev. Franciscus Elgersma) published in

¹⁶ Cf. especially the Acta of the Particular Synod of South Holland in the 1660's, and the Friesland Proclamations of 1662 and 1687.

Leeuwarden in 1685, in which it is declared that "all kinds of false prophets, light-headed visionaries, self-conceited free-speakers, frivolous Collegiants, and other forgers of lies (*Leugenstoffeerders*) are raising their horns against the Reformed Church; and among these are not only Socinians and Papists, but some other ill-concealed vagabonds, who being covered as it were (*quamzuijs*) with a Mennonitish mantel, have crept in among the synagogues of the Mennonites."

These clerical complaints resulted in the issuance by the Stadtholder and States of Friesland of a Proclamation, in 1687, repeating the Proclamations of 1662 which denounced "the devilish errors of the Quakers" and banished their "godless sect," on pain of five years' imprisonment at hard labor, and forbade the printing and distribution of their books. So alarmed did the Friesland Mennonites themselves become that they turned upon the Quakers in Harlingen and caused the imprisonment of three of them in Leeuwarden; one of whom died in its gaol.¹⁷

THE MENNONITE TRIUMPH IN HOLLAND

When the storm against the Quakers finally blew over, the Mennonites and the States became tolerant of them; but the Quakers were unable to obtain equality of treatment with the other Protestant sects. This discrimination appeared, for example, in 1737, when the Friends of Amsterdam sought an abatement of taxes on their meeting-house, such as the Mennonites had obtained. Their petition for this to the States of Holland and West Friesland states that "since they, the suppliants, are a Protestant denomination as much as are the Mennonites, and their aforesaid church was taxed, in the last levy of the hun-

¹⁷ Cf. "Een Uytroepinge tegens de Vervolginghe . . . in Vrieslandt," Amsterdam, 1670 and 1671.

dredth penny on real estate, for the sum of thirty-four guldens, twelve stuivers (District 45, page 112), this being the only church of this Society in Amsterdam or elsewhere in this Province [North Holland], which is included in the tax, and their congregation being small and of few resources, and still burdened with the support of a few needy persons . . .” This appeal was denied by the States on the 16th. of August, 1738.

Henceforth, the Mennonites retained their privileged position over the Quakers; and they were also accused by the latter of yielding to political pressure in regard to taking the oath and performing military service. The Quakers of Holland, as elsewhere, strove valiantly against this pressure during the warfare of the eighteenth century; but the series of wars connected with the French Revolution and Napoleon proved almost too much for the Mennonites, who yielded more and more to military demands. These wars administered a coup de grâce to the Society of Friends in the Netherlands.

The growing materialism of the Age of Reason and Comfort, and the flight to America were among the other causes of Dutch Quakerism’s decline and fall; while re-absorption of the younger generations of Quaker families in the ancestral Mennonite society was the sad fate, or the poetic justice, which overtook many a Dutch Quaker lad and lassie (or *jongeling* and *meisje*).

As early as 1757, Catherine Phillips, wrote in her journal:

Rotterdam is a large city, which formerly had a meeting; there is still a meeting-house, and there are a few who were educated among us, but they had so little regard to the testimony of Truth and the welfare of their souls as to entirely neglect assembling to worship the Almighty, yet were not content to profess with any other people. The Meeting House

is under the care of a descendant of Friends; we called, and had the house prepared for a meeting on our return. He behaved very civilly, but appeared very distant from the profession of his ancestors. These persons were great tradesmen, had become rich and were much in the grandeur of this world, and were now of the society of the Mennists or Baptists.

A dozen years later, John Eliot and his companions were distressed to find that the Friends of Hoorn and Twisk had been almost entirely absorbed into the Mennonite congregation; and the same fate overtook many of the descendants of the seventeenth century Quakers of Friesland and Holland who had so staunchly borne the standard of their society during their day and generation.

THE TIE THAT BINDS

Thus we find, at the end of our study as at its beginning, that early English Quakerism entered into, instead of came out of, the Mennonite community. And even though it unconsciously and indirectly borrowed some of its beliefs and practices from the Mennonites of Holland by way of the Baptists of England, it may have contributed directly and indirectly through the Quakers of Holland to the development of the Mennonite faith and conduct. In the valley of the Rhine, from the Palatinate to the mouths of the great river between Rotterdam and Amsterdam, and across the Atlantic in the valleys of the Schuylkill and Delaware and many another Pennsylvania river, Mennonites and Quakers have lived and worked and suffered together. Their intimate association for six generations in the Dutch Republic of two centuries and a half ago, may have been a strong and enduring tie that has served to bind them closely together in the new American Republic of our own day.

Joseph Hewes, The Quaker Signer

Charles Francis Jenkins

IX

JOSEPH HEWES, THE QUAKER SIGNER

If you should ask the average intelligent American if there were any Quakers among the Signers of the Declaration of Independence, he would probably pause a moment and then, recalling John Trumbull's familiar painting of the Signing, with Stephen Hopkins standing in the background wearing his beaver hat, he would answer yes. And yet at the time of the signing Stephen Hopkins was not a member of the Society of Friends, having been disowned by Smithfield Monthly Meeting, (Rhode Island), in 1773, for refusing to sell a negro slave. Whether he wore his hat in assemblies of this kind would be a question, and whether in the strain and stress of revolutionary activities he remained firm in his attachment to the principles of Quakerism and considered himself a bona fide Friend, I do not know. But in the Continental Congress there was another man who apparently took little stock in his Quaker membership, yet who was born a Friend—a member of Chesterfield Monthly Meeting in New Jersey, who never relinquished his membership, or was disowned, and whose death was faithfully recorded in the records of his Monthly Meeting. This was Joseph Hewes, one of the three delegates from the State of North Carolina, whose name appears on that now faded, yet ever immortal document, the "Declaration of Independence of the Thirteen Colonies."

There were other members of the Congress who through

inheritance were connected with the Quakers. Richard Stockton from New Jersey was the grandson of active Friends, and the Signer is buried in the peaceful burying ground adjoining Stony Brook Meeting, near Princeton, with the affairs of which his ancestors were intimately connected. Stockton's daughter Julia married Dr. Benjamin Rush, another Signer and grandson of concerned Quakers. In writing to John Adams in his later years, he confessed that he still felt nearest to them in religious fellowship. Charles Thomson, the perpetual Secretary of the Congress, had been principal of the Friends' School in Philadelphia and, while brought up a Presbyterian, he had married into a Friends' family, and in his old age, while not connected with any religious organization he has stated that his inclinations were mostly with the Quakers. It is Dr. Rush, who has in his Memoirs left us a complete biography of Joseph Hewes. Any amplification of it is merely multiplying words. It is as follows: "A plain, worthy merchant, well acquainted with business. He seldom spoke in Congress, but was very useful on Committees."

The approach of the fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence naturally turned the attention of the country to the men who had affixed their names to this foundation of our political fabric. A young Philadelphia lawyer, John Sanderson, proceeded to carry out the ambitious project of a series of lives of the Signers, each to be written by the person best qualified for the task. Sanderson's *Lives of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence* in nine volumes was the result, the first appeared in 1820 and the task was completed in 1827 by other hands. Three of these men, whose lives were to be included in the series, were still living and growing in public regard as the years unfolded. Two of them had been the chief actors in bringing the Revolution to a

successful outcome. After a period of sad estrangement Thomas Jefferson and John Adams were exchanging letters and friendly reminiscences of their long public life, and it is one of the remarkable coincidences of our history that their two lives, so different in environment and education, should have progressed along parallel lines. One had written the Declaration, the other had exerted the most potent force in its passage. Of all the fifty-six Signers they alone became Presidents of the United States, both had served as Vice-Presidents and both passed away on the exact fiftieth anniversary of the date of the Declaration, July 4, 1826. Two years later, on July 4, 1828, the venerable Charles Carroll of Carrollton, the only Catholic among the Signers, was to lay the corner stone of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, thus linking the formation of the Republic with one of the greatest instruments of our modern development. Carroll lived four years after this event, respected by the nation, beloved by his friends and family, surrounded by every comfort, in possession of all his faculties, to a beautiful old age. He alone of all the Signers had read to him by the author, H. B. Latrobe, the sketch of his life as it appears in Sanderson's *Lives*. "He listened with marked attention and without a comment until I had ceased to read," wrote the author, "when after a pause, he said, 'Why Latrobe, you have made a much greater man of me than I thought I was and yet you have said nothing in what you have written that is not true.'"

Unfortunately, the same tribute to the accuracy of this biographical sketch cannot be bestowed on many of the others. As the nine volumes approached completion it was necessary to employ someone to write those for whom there seemed no especially qualified biographer, and the sketch of Joseph Hewes was written by Edward Ingersoll of Philadelphia. Fifty years was too early a date to write

a satisfactory biography of most of these conspicuous men. The great mass of historical documents, letters and journals, which have come to light and which in many cases have been printed and thus made available to students of history, are replete with facts which were not accessible to these early writers. Exact information was meagre and tradition and memory in too many cases supplied distorted and inadequate portraits. No one of the Signers suffered more in this respect than Joseph Hewes of North Carolina. By way of apology Mr. Ingersoll says:

Concerning Joseph Hewes the circumstances known are much less abundant and particular than we desire. Nearly half a century has passed since he died, he left no children, no very near relatives, no survivor from whom the details of his life could be ascertained. His parents were members of the Society of Friends and at the time of their marriage resided in the colony of Connecticut, in one of the settlements the farthest removed from the coast of the Atlantic. In this situation they were obliged to bear the double persecution arising from the often excited hostility of the Indians, who roved through the forests in their vicinity, and the prejudice still remaining among the Puritans of New England, against all that wore the Quaker habiliments or professed the Quaker doctrines. For persons of this persuasion, and indeed for all that were ambitious of a quiet and secure life, a residence in either Connecticut or Massachusetts, was at that period far from desirable. The government of Massachusetts had, in order to "promote enterprise and encourage volunteers," raised the premium on Indian scalps and prisoners to one hundred pounds for each; and in the temper of mind which is sufficiently indicated by such an enactment, a bitter and murderous warfare was waged against the natives of the forest, attended with circumstances often discreditable to the humanity of the white men, and with instances of reprisals and retaliation on the part of the Indians involving the most shocking barbarities. The province of Connecticut had refused to unite in any measures of war that were not defensive;

but the Indians were not always careful to observe the boundary line between the two colonies, or to discriminate between people so closely resembling each other in manners and appearance. The inoffensive and industrious farmers of Connecticut were therefore exposed to suffer the vengeance intended to be dealt upon the scalping parties of Massachusetts, and many of them moved off from the lands they had prepared for cultivation, to seek a more secure asylum in a southern colony. Among these emigrants were Aaron and Providence Hewes, who made their escape from the scenes of savage warfare not without difficulty and imminent personal risk; so near, indeed, were they to the scene of danger, that in crossing the Housatonic river, they were almost overtaken by the Indians, and were within the actual range of their bullets, one of which wounded Providence in the neck.

Transcripts from the records of various Monthly Meetings of the Society of Friends will show how far afield was this fanciful account.

Eight years before the arrival of William Penn, a certain William Hughes of the Parish of St. Pauls, Shadwell, in the county of Middlesex, a cooper, and his wife Deborah, patented five hundred acres in Fenwick's New Jersey Colony; he later moved across the river into Pennsylvania near Marcus Hook, continuing, however, to own land on both sides of the river. As a Pennsylvanian he was one of the founders of Chichester Meeting, in southeastern Delaware County, Pennsylvania. This William Hughes died in 1698, leaving a son, also William, who seems to have lived in south Jersey and the year after his father's death married Sarah Bezer under the care of Concord (Pa.) Monthly Meeting. They were the parents of a numerous family, including a son Aaron, next to the youngest, who later was to be the father of Joseph Hewes, the Signer. This Aaron Hughes, who by this time spelled his name H-e-w-e-s had met and married Providence Worth, the daughter of Joseph Worth of Stony Brook,

N. J. The latter was a prominent miller on Stony Brook near what is now Princeton, and it was over his farm that later a considerable portion of the maneuvering occurred at the Battle of Princeton. Providence was the fifth child and second daughter. To Chesterfield Monthly Meeting which included the meeting at Stony Brook, Aaron Hewes presented himself armed with a certificate in the usual form but somewhat deficient as to spelling:

from oure Monthly Meeting of Chichester and Concord held at Concord Meeting house the third day of ye 2nd Mo. 1727.

To the Monthly Meeting of friends att Crowix in West New Jersey with the Salutation of oure deir love In the fellowship of the gospel. Thees are to certifie you that the bearer heire of Aron Hews hath lived before us his Inclination to settle within the verg of your Monthly meeting and in order thei to requested of us a certificate to you on that account. Now thees are to certifie you that nesarey inquiry hath bin maid and we find that he hath bin a onist and Industerous young man and of a sobere and orderly conversation and a frequenter of our meetings free from all women on the account of marriages far as we know.

So desiring his growth and prosperity in the truth we recommend his to your further christian care

Signed in and by order of said meeting by

WILLIAM HEWES

RALPH EAVENSON

& 29 other names.

Aaron and Providence Hewes were married in Third month, 1727, under the care of Chesterfield Monthly Meeting and then or later removed to what is now the little hamlet of Kingston, some two miles east of the present town of Princeton. They were the parents of six children, four sons and two daughters, of whom Joseph the second child and oldest son was born Fourth month 28, 1730. Aaron Hewes, the father, died in 1753 and was

buried in Stony Brook Friends' burying ground. *The Friend of Philadelphia* of 1858, a hundred and five years after his death, contained a notice of him, it is short and indicates his close connection with the Society of Friends.

AARON HUGHES (Hewes)

Aaron Hughes of Stony Brook, West Jersey, was an overseer and elder in the church, and "very servicable." He was a hospitable entertainer of Ministering Friends and kind in accompanying them to neighboring meetings. He was "of an exemplary conversation." He deceased Seventh mo. 17th, 1753, being in the 53d year of his age.

The two daughters of the family had married and married well, before their father's death. Sarah, the oldest child, married Nathaniel Allen of Philadelphia, of a family long associated with the colony, and Mary Hewes, the fourth child, had married Abel Middleton of Nottingham in the County of Burlington, N. J. The three older sons of Aaron and Providence, Joseph, Josiah and Daniel, all left the farm in their youth and removed to Philadelphia. In the *New York Mercury* of 1756 appeared quite a modern real estate notice and this contemporary account describes the probable birthplace and early home of Joseph Hewes. The place in modern times has been called "Mayberry Hill" located on Snowden Lane.

To be sold, a plantation in Somerset County in East Jersey late the estate of Aaron Hews deceased, containing between 3 and 4 hundred acres. The one half cleared and in good fence, about 30 acres thereof in good meadow and more may be made. A good large stone dwelling house and kitchen; large barn, granery and several other buildings. It is well watered and timbered, the title indisputable. It is situated between Kingston and Princeton, and might be suited to any gentleman that is concerned with the College. It is thought by good judges that there is a copper mine thereon. Any

person inclined to purchase may inquire of William Worth of Princeton, Samuel Worth of Stony Brook or Josiah Hews of Phila., opposite to Black Horse Alley in 2nd St.

These commonplace details and records will show how far the actual facts were removed from the lurid tales of the Indian pursuit of the family on the banks of the Housatonic in Connecticut.

So far there is no record available of Joseph Hewes' life on the farm, his schooling or training as a merchant in Philadelphia. Some of the early accounts made him a student at Princeton College, but his name does not appear in any list of students. He may have been associated with Joseph Ogden, a merchant and tavern keeper of the Cross Keys at the corner of Third and Chestnut Streets, who had married a Hewes and was a relative by marriage, and with whom Joseph Hewes's brother Josiah later entered into partnership.

Joseph Hewes came to Philadelphia, probably about 1750, a young man of twenty. This was about the time that the interest of Philadelphia Friends was greatly aroused over a revival of Quakerism in the little island of Tortola, one of the Virgin Islands in the West Indies, and a considerable intercourse resulted. In 1752 Joseph Hewes apparently made up his mind to enter business there and applied for and received a certificate to the meeting of Friends in that Island, but it seems unlikely he ever went there and certainly he did not settle there. There is no record in the Tortola records that the certificate was ever presented.

Joseph Ogden was a considerable merchant importing dry goods in quantity from England and shipping ginseng, beeswax and other colonial products in exchange. It would be probable that his young kinsman sailed as supercargo on the sloops and schooners connected with this

trade. By 1753 Joseph Hewes had decided to settle at Edenton, North Carolina, and in October of that year he set out on the "good schooner" *Friendship*, Benjamin Flower, Master, with his little store of merchandise to be transferred to North Carolina at the rate of three pounds Pennsylvania currency per ton. The bill of lading for this initial shipment has recently come to light. As it gives the stock in trade of a general merchant in those Colonial days, we may take a moment to go over it. The most important and expensive item was a piece of cotton goods listed as Ozenbriggs, but really Osnaburg, a coarse cloth first made at Osnaburg in Germany of flax and tow and always a considerable item in the merchandise of the Colonial period, particularly in the southern states, as it was largely used as clothing for the slaves. Of this there were 100 ells at 16 pence per ell. Then followed "Lining check," Broadcloth "flanning," worsted damask and Duroy. There were twelve women's black silk bath bonnetts, a dozen men's silk caps, fifteen pounds of powder, knives and forks, snuff boxes, shoe buckles, buttons, butter pots, milk pans, bottles and porringers, five cheeses and two short cloth cloaks. The total bill amounted to £64-2-8 which Hewes paid for with snakeroot, beeswax, myrtle wax and rice, valued at £31 and the balance in cash. That he paid for his merchandise with these native products of the south may indicate that he had earlier gone to North Carolina and had come north to replenish his stock and visit his relatives in and near Philadelphia.

Edenton where Joseph Hewes carried on as a merchant during the remainder of his life is in northeastern North Carolina on a little bay opening out into Albemarle Sound. It loomed far larger in the political and mercantile world in the seventeen hundreds than it does today. George Fox had visited its site in 1671 calling on the

Governor, who lived nearby, where he was "lovingly received." "We tarried at the Governor's that night and next morning he very courteously walked with us about two miles through the woods to a place whither he had sent our boat about to meet us." By 1710 Edenton had become a village of considerable importance usually called Roanoke, but upon the death of Governor Charles Eden in 1722, it was named Edenton in his honor. It was a busy, bustling place with considerable European trade and in one year forty-three vessels arrived from foreign ports, and anchored in its shallow harbor. Edenton is the center of a region of unbounded fertility. The whole country is intersected with deep creeks with ordinarily a bold bluff on one side, and on the other side of the stream impenetrable swamps. A little to the southeast of Edenton lies Roanoke Island where in 1585, Sir Walter Raleigh left his first colony and where was born Virginia Dare, the first child of European parentage born in America.

Of Joseph Hewes's homes or warehouses in Edenton, one dwelling is still pointed out as the place where he boarded at one time, and a diminutive tablet in the brick wall at the northeast corner of Main and King Streets marks the site of his store. In recent years a wind storm from the west blew the water out of Albemarle Sound, and the timbers of the Hewes wharf were exposed. As a merchant he had prospered greatly and by 1768 he had become one of the leading citizens of the town. In that year James Iredell, a young man of seventeen, arrived in Edenton from England, who, in twenty-two years, by his natural abilities and diligence had mastered the law, been appointed to many positions of trust and in 1790 was made, by President Washington, a justice of the first Supreme Court of the United States. In setting out for Edenton with letters in his pocket he was particularly

guided by one from a relative who told him "You will find the gentlemen of Edenton very agreeable; particularly cultivate the notice of Mr. Hewes."

Until Joseph Hewes emerges on the platform of colonial affairs and until his diaries or personal letters are uncovered, what meagre details we have of his personal comings and goings are contained in the letters of James Iredell, for he successfully and tactfully cultivated the notice of Mr. Hewes and they became life-long friends.

Shortly after reaching Edenton, Joseph Hewes had a love affair which profoundly influenced his future life. A little stream, Queen Ann's Creek, skirts Edenton on the east and beyond it facing the bay is "Hays" a beautiful estate, the house in the midst of a vigorous grove and the ground sloping down to the bay. At that time it was the home of Samuel Johnston, his wife and children, including several unmarried sisters. Of these Isabella was next to the youngest of the family. Joseph Hewes became interested in her, they became engaged to be married, but a short time before the marriage Isabella Johnston died, leaving him so affected that he never married. His relations with the Johnstons were as one of the family and he was always so regarded by them, this intimacy continuing until his death.

In James Iredell's letters there are a few glimpses of Hewes' social life of Edenton. "As I was walking home I called at 'Hornsblows,' which was the leading tavern of the town, 'to see who and who were together.'" "Mr. Hewes and Jackson were playing backgammon." "Mr. Worth and Mr. Littlejohn looking on." "Just saw a bit and came away." A few days later Iredell records in his diary "afterwards went uptown had my hair dressed; went to church with Mrs. Blair, the Miss Johnstons and Mr. Hewes. Nobody to make the responses but Mr. Hewes

and myself and neither of us had a prayer book. Mr. Hewes asked me to dine with him. After dinner Sir Nat. Dunkefield, Mr. Hewes and myself went over to Mr. Johnston's, drank tea, spent the evening there very agreeably." James Iredell was thus early casting his hopes on Hannah Johnston, the youngest daughter at "Hays," who later was to become his wife. Two years after these trifling incidents of dining and tea drinking Iredell pictures the Hays' household to his mother. He writes "They are all united by the tenderest ties of affection and ever preserve an uninterrupted harmony of agreement, which is maintained by a general share of good sense, cultivated understandings and engaging manners that I have never seen excelled, if equaled. They are truly families of love and are known to be so by all their acquaintances." Then the young writer turns his attention to the other sex. "There is a gentleman in this town who is a very particular favorite of mine, as indeed he is of everybody, for he is one of the best and most agreeable men in the world. His name is Hewes. He is a merchant here and our member for the town, the patron and greatest honor to it. About six years ago he was within a very few days of being married to one of Mr. Johnston's sisters who died rather suddenly and this unhappy circumstance for a long time embittered every satisfaction in life to him. He has continued ever since unmarried, which I believe he will always do. His connection with Mr. Johnston's family is just such as if he had been really a brother-in-law, a circumstance that naturally does honor to them both." At another date Iredell records in his diary: "I took a walk with Mr. Hewes to his wharf and spent a happy afternoon with him at his home. . . . As a man and a gentleman possessed of an excellent understanding and blest with a good

heart, Mr. Hewes is deserving the honor and respect universally shown him."

An entry of January 19, 1775 shows how far Joseph Hewes had departed from the ways of strict Friends of his day. "Busy at my office till one," Iredell writes, "was asked to dine with Mr. Johnston, did so, came over in the evening and being obliged to go up town to shut my windows I was tempted to go and spend the evening with Mr. Hewes, repented it when I went as they were playing cards all the time. Came home between ten and eleven." Perhaps the liveliest and gayest of all the friends of Hewes who centered around Edenton, was Sir Nathaniel Dunkinfield whose plantation was not far away. Sir Nathaniel Dunkinfield returned to England upon the Revolution, bought a commission in the Army, but resigned rather than fight against his old time friends in North Carolina, and for a number of years he kept up a correspondence with them.

In December, 1773, Joseph Hewes and Samuel Johnston of Edenton and William Hooper of Cape Fear had been appointed by the Assembly of North Carolina a Committee of Correspondence. Virginia had previously suggested the formation of permanent Committees of Correspondence to extend to all the Colonies. This was gradually accomplished and the system was effective in spreading the idea of resistance, welding the colonies to a common cause and leading to an almost spontaneous and simultaneous movement for the formation of a Continental Congress. The colony of New York issued the first call, other colonies followed and the meeting was called to meet in Philadelphia on the 5th of September, 1774.

On the 5th of September, the day set for the meeting of Congress, John Adams writes his Abigail, "The delegates

all met at the City Tavern and walked to the Carpenters Hall, where they took a view of the room and of the chamber where is an excellent library. There is also a long entry where gentlemen may walk, and a convenient chamber opposite to the library. The general cry was this was a good room. . . ." It was not until the work of the Congress had been well under way however that North Carolina was represented, when Joseph Hewes and William Hooper attended and produced their credentials. They had not arrived earlier because the General Meeting of the inhabitants of North Carolina, convened at Newbern, had not selected them until the 25th of August. They probably travelled by sea. They were the same day added to the committee to state the rights of the Colonies.

Joseph Hewes' account of his early doings as a member of Congress and his committee work during the sitting of this first Congress has not as yet been discovered. There was a constant round of social engagements, the leading Friends opening their doors for the entertainment of the visiting delegates. Washington attended Friends' Meeting in the big Meeting House at 2nd and Market Streets on September 25th. On the 16th a great banquet was tendered the delegates in the State House, nearly three hundred guests being present. To show that at this early date Independence, except in a few fiery minds, was far from the thoughts of the assembled guests; among the toasts given and drunk with applause, were to the King and Queen, the Prince of Wales, and also one to the "Perpetual Union of the Colonies." Silas Deane, in one of his gossipy letters to his wife, written on the 23rd, says:

The North Carolina delegates being now arrived I will fill up the space by telling you there are three of them, Mr. Hooper, Mr. Caswell and Mr. Hewes. The first is a Bostonian, bred and educated at Cambridge College, classmate with Jo-

seph Trumbull, a lawyer by profession, ingenious, polite, spirited and tolerably eloquent. The other two were men of about forty to appearance; of sedate and settled characters well affected to the general cause but have not spoke as yet publicly.

Congress adjourned on the 27th of October 1774, having completed its labors and providing that another Congress should meet on the 10th of May next. A few days later Joseph Hewes wrote his friend Iredell:

Philadelphia, 31st Oct., 1774.

I had a very disagreeable time of it till I arrived here, since which, I have had but little health and less spirits.

The Congress broke up, on Thursday last, their proceedings are now in the press, part of which is published, and which I now send directed to myself as postmaster at Edenton. I have the pleasure to inform you that they are generally approved of here by all ranks of people; the Germans who compose a large part of the inhabitants of this province are all on our side; the sweets of liberty little known in their own country are here enjoyed by them in its utmost latitude. Our friends are under apprehension that administration will endeavor to lay hold of as many delegates as possible, and have them carried to England and tried as rebels, this induced the Congress to enter into a resolve in such cases to make a reprisal. I have no fears on that head, but should it be my lot, no man on earth could be better spared. Were I to suffer in the cause of American Liberty should I not be translated immediately to Heaven as Enoch was of old?

I consider myself extremely happy in the good opinion my friends at Edenton have of me. I wish I had merit to entitle me to it. They have my grateful acknowledgment. I am much pleased with Miss Nelly's (Nelly Blair) letter, and am sorry I have trifled away so much time as not to be able to answer it by this post.

Dear Sir,

Your obedient friend and servant,
JOSEPH HEWES.

After the adjournment of Congress, Hewes returned to Edenton to take part in the political and revolutionary activities of the colony. On the 5th of April, 1775, at a general assembly of the inhabitants of North Carolina, William Hooper, Joseph Hewes and Richard Caswell were again appointed delegates to attend the General Congress to be held in Philadelphia on the 10th of May next, or any other time or place, their acts to be obligatory in honor of every inhabitant of the state. The Assembly also thanked them for the faithful and judicial discharge of the important trust reposed in them in the late Continental Congress.

On this occasion the North Carolina delegates were on hand in good time and soon all, particularly Hooper and Hewes, were deep in the duties and activities of the Congress. Hewes was one of a Committee of Five, of which Washington was Chairman, appointed on June 3rd to bring in an estimate of the money needed to be raised; ten days later the same committee was appointed to bring in a draft of Rules and Regulations for the government of the Army. The next day Washington was appointed Commander-in-Chief of the Army. Their report was ready by the 30th and Hewes was one of a Committee of Three to have the Regulations examined and printed as soon as possible. Later Hewes was appointed on a Committee to make inquiry in all the colonies after virgin lead and leaden ore and the best method of collecting, smelting and refining it, also as to the cheapest and easiest methods of making salt. In October he was added to the Committee on Claims and a few days later to the Committee to fit out vessels of war; then in December he was appointed on an all Colony Committee to devise ways and means of furnishing these colonies with a naval armament. And so it went, Hewes with his practical experience as a

merchant, shipper and vessel owner was soon engrossed in work. He has been described as the first Secretary of the Navy and his labors in planning, building and equipping the infant navy were so great and continuous that to them was later ascribed much of his ill health and eventually, his early death. John Paul Jones, later to become one of the outstanding figures in our naval history, was a particular friend and protégé of Hewes. In endorsing a letter from the former to the latter, Hewes says: "To me who knows him better than anyone else." In his troubles, chafing at delays and what he considered injustices, Jones frequently turned to Hewes for advice and assistance.

We have a glimpse of Hewes taking some of his crowded time to do a favor for his friends in Edenton. On July 8th he writes Iredell:

I have sent by Captain Hatch's sloop ten pairs of shoes for yourself and six pairs for Mrs. Iredell and Mrs. Dawson. I did intend to have sent double the number for the ladies but could not prevail with the workman to get them ready in time; the demand for women's shoes is so great that the makers cannot complete half their orders; when a tradesman has made a thousand promises and broke them all, he has one answer for every charge: "Sir, I have been under arms in the field."

Congress adjourned on August 1st to reassemble on September 5th. On September 2nd, Hewes was again elected a delegate for a term of one year, together with his friend Hooper and a new man, John Penn, took the place of Richard Caswell. Sometime between the 21st and 27th of September, Hewes was back in Philadelphia and with increasing influence and usefulness was entering in the business of Congress. But by December 1st he gives to Samuel Johnston this picture of the work of Congress:

We grow tired and indolent, captious, jealous and want a recess, these only discover themselves now and then, in general

we are pretty unanimous and friendly. No plan of separation has been offered. . . . I am weary of politics and wish I could retire to my former private station (to speak in the language of I. Child) a pence and farthing man.

Nevertheless he labored away apologizing for his many complaints as to the burden he was carrying and his continued ill health. Writing to Iredell March 26, he says:

I think myself declining fast, such close attention to business every day in Congress till three, four and sometimes five o'clock, and on committees almost every evening and frequently in the morning before Congress meets is too much for my constitution. I send you enclosed the locket you desired me to get made for Mrs. Iredell; the jeweller was a long time about it. . . . In these times when every mechanic is employed in learning how to kill Englishmen it is impossible to get anything done right. . . . My compliments to Miss Nelly, . . . tell her I am getting my picture drawn in miniature, and as she may never have an opportunity of seeing the original again I shall send it to her when it is finished.

It is presumed that it was from this miniature that the only known portrait of Joseph Hewes has been made. When the picture arrived in Edenton, Hewes's negro servants were invited to come and see it, and Iredell reports they were transported with it. "I met CAM at the door one day and brought him in," he writes. "He was in perfect ecstasy. 'Master every bit,' says he. 'Ah the old gentleman is grown handsome!'"

Despite his ill health Hewes' war-like ardor was not abated, and he was writing his home friends that he had furnished himself with a good musket and bayonet and "when I am no longer useful in Council I shall be willing to take the field, I think I would rather fall than be carried off by a lingering illness. An obstinate ague and fever or rather an intermittent fever persecutes me con-

tinually. I have no way to remove it unless I retire from Congress and public life, this I am determined not to do till North Carolina sends another delegate, provided I am able to crawl to the Congress chamber." Another minor matter troubled him when his colored servant Peter slipped on the ice as he was going to the pump for a pitcher of water and broke his leg and was helpless for two months or more.

Writing in his later years, John Adams gives the graphic picture of the decision of Hewes to cast the vote of North Carolina for Independency:

For many days the majority depended on Mr. Hewes of North Carolina. While a member one day was speaking and reading documents from all the colonies to prove that public opinion, the general sense of all, was in favor of the measure, when he came to North Carolina and produced letters and public proceedings which demonstrated that the majority in that colony were in favor of it, Mr. Hewes, who had hitherto constantly voted against it, started suddenly upright and lifting both hands to heaven as if he had been in a trance, cried out, "It is done and I will abide by it." I would give more for the perfect painting of the terror and horror upon the face of the old majority at that critical moment than for the best piece of Raphael. The question, however, was eluded by an immediate motion for adjournment.

On July 2nd the vote on Independency was taken and John Penn arrived from North Carolina in time to cast his vote for it. By the time the parchment document was ready for signing on August 2nd, William Hooper had also returned to Philadelphia and their names, William Hooper, Joseph Hewes and John Penn appear in the order named at the top of the second column from the left. Joseph Hewes rather singularly has omitted the great scroll or paraph from under his name which appears in all the signatures to his letters of the period, and which are

so prominent in Franklin's signature and some others.

Let us pause a moment in the further consideration of Joseph Hewes's revolutionary and military activities, to survey the conflicting currents of patriotic impulse and religious conviction, as they engulfed the religious society of which he was a member. The first Continental Congress of 1774 was not a revolutionary body. If separation was in the minds of some of its delegates, particularly those from Massachusetts, they took great pains to conceal it. When the Massachusetts delegates had been met at Frankford, as they approached Philadelphia in 1774, they were called aside by representatives of the Sons of Liberty and cautioned as to their conduct. They were told "The word Independence must not be uttered neither in Congress or in private conversation. The idea of Independence is as unpopular in Pennsylvania and in all the middle and southern colonies as the stamp act itself." It was necessary to pursue a prudent course to secure and retain the important conservative and the Quaker influence, for as the latter went so would go the Germans in the colony. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting had early sensed the drift of affairs and at the Meeting for Sufferings, after the adjournment of the first Congress, had adopted a minute and appointed a committee to deal with those who had taken part in approving the resolves of the late Congress which, the minute stated, "contained divers resolutions very contrary to our Christian professions." There began the official action relating to the Revolution, which for a number of years was to put Quakerism to perhaps the severest test it had yet encountered, after its experiences in the Quaker invasion of Massachusetts.

That the Society of Friends went through the trying days of the Revolution and still existed, is a testimony to the soundness of its basic fundamentals. The war was

indeed a series of major surgical operations and that the patient survived is a testimonial to its inherited good health, soundness and spiritual strength. We ourselves have lived through one such operation and grave and difficult as it was, it did not compare in severity with the difficulties our ancestors encountered in those "days that tried men's souls."

Friends as a united body did not approve the varied and devious proceedings of the British ministry, which irritated and alarmed the colonies and they had participated in the petitions and meetings of protest, but they did not believe in revolution, they desired to be counted out of the whole business, to remain peacefully in their homes; neutrals in the conflict which many saw coming, taking no part in the "commotions," a name frequently applied to the disorders of the time. But such a course was well nigh impossible in the fever and heat of revolution, "he who is not for us is against us" and the Society was soon supplying grist to the upper and nether millstones of the political mill.

There were many active and aggressive revolutionists. Then there was a great body who, while sympathizing more or less openly with the cause of the colonies, took no active part. Perhaps an equal number were what soon came to be called Tories and a very small number actively espoused the British cause. Two of these, Abraham Carlisle and John Roberts, members of Meeting, were publicly hanged in Philadelphia for aiding the British, and at least one member was disowned for joining the British army. But the main body of the Yearly Meeting, no matter what their sympathies were or views as to government, held steadfast to the principle that Friends cannot fight nor have any part in warlike preparations or profit by them in any way.

A careful observer has stated that about one fifth of the adult male members of the Yearly Meeting in Philadelphia joined the Revolutionary army or had taken places under the new government. The large majority, with many difficulties and with varying sympathies, followed the course of neutrality and non-participation. It was naturally among the younger men that the defection was greatest and there can be no doubt that the Society suffered and may even now be suffering from their going off, for few of them ever returned.

In September of 1776, Joseph Hewes having visited his mother and relatives in New Jersey returned to Edenton bearing a letter from his colleagues Hooper and Penn to the Council of Safety of North Carolina speaking in the highest terms of the labors of their colleagues:

This will be handed you by our worthy colleague Mr. Hewes, who after a long and diligent attendance in Congress and of the different committees of which he has been a member is now upon his return home. From the large share of naval & mercantile business which has been allotted to his attention by Congress, his health has been much injured; we wish his journey may tend to restore it & that he may enjoy in his recess from publick employment much happiness among his Countrymen whom it has been his unwearied endeavor to Serve while he has been in publick trust.

The increasing importance of Edenton as a source of supplies is shown by the fact that Congress about this time established a regular packet service between Philadelphia and Edenton and Hewes probably returned that way. The Convention to frame a constitution for the state of North Carolina was about to meet and in its deliberations Joseph Hewes took a prominent part. His health was still far from good. On March 9, 1777, Hewes says "I have been very much indisposed which has pre-

vented me from leaving home. I am now getting better but the weather continues so very bad here that it would not be prudent for me to set out in my weak infirm state." And after discussing the capture of some British vessels he asks "are none of the lottery tickets to be sent this way on public account?" "If not pray send me one hundred of them for myself and friends."

Hewes had intended to return to Congress about April 1st but as the new Assembly under the new State Constitution was to assemble at Newbern on April 2nd he deemed it prudent to wait until they had either selected new delegates or confirmed the old ones. It is well he did for when the ballot was announced, Penn had been chosen in his stead by a decisive vote. Mr. Penn had industriously circulated a story that Hewes had been holding two offices, a delegate to Congress and a member of the Secret Committee in which position he was making a fortune out of the public business and this was why he was remaining so long away from Congress. Hewes's friends were filled with indignation and William Hooper resigned the next day. Others hastened to show their confidence in him.

Other business troubles had come to Mr. Hewes. Sometime late in 1775 the firm of Hewes and Smith had loaded a brigantine, the *Joseph*, Captain Emperor Morely, and sent her to Cadiz in Spain, where she was detained for several months by British men of war cruising off the harbor. In November she had slipped out loaded with three thousand bushels of salt, some Jesuit bark, a quantity of wine and other articles of value. Before reaching Edenton the *Joseph* was seized and made a prize by the privateer *Eagle*, Captain Brazilla Smith of Boston. Hewes and Smith immediately petitioned Congress for redress. It seemed that privateering was practically pirateering. President Hancock wrote to the Massachusetts Assembly

urging that full restitution be made and the offenders punished. In this letter we get another contemporary opinion as to the character of Joseph Hewes. Hewes had journeyed to Philadelphia, secured the resolutions of Congress regarding the seizure and started on horseback for Boston. Hancock writes of him:

Mr. Hewes, who is the bearer hereof and one of the owners of the brig was a member of Congress for a considerable length of time in the Representation from North Carolina. From the enclosed Memorial you will perceive the sense his constituents entertain of his merit—to which I shall only add that his conduct as an inflexible patriot and his liberality as a Gentleman justly entitled him, not only to their protection, but to the Notice and protection of every good citizen and friend of America.

His ill health still continued and the weary man expressed the thought that if his health did not mend on this journey that he would perhaps wish himself out of the world.

During the twenty years of his mercantile life Hewes had several partners. At the time of the Revolution the firm was Hewes and Smith. The following year Nathaniel Allen, Jr., the son of his sister Sarah, a young man who had followed his uncle to Edenton, was admitted to partnership and the firm of Hewes, Smith & Allen, continued until dissolved by the death of the senior partner. This Nathaniel Allen, "Natt" to his uncle, continued in Edenton. He was the father of William Allen who, born in Edenton, migrated to Ohio. He ran for Congress, was elected by a majority of one, was later elected to the Senate. In Washington he was known as the "Ohio gong" so powerful was his voice. He is said to have originated in 1844 the political catch word "Fifty-four forty or fight"

referring to the Oregon boundary question. A nephew of his, the son of the only daughter of Nathaniel Allen, Jr. of Edenton was the distinguished statesman, Allen G. Thurman, who in 1888 was nominated for the vice-presidency of the United States on the ticket with Grover Cleveland.

February 4, 1779, Hewes was again elected to the Continental Congress for a period of one year.

Towards the end of July he set out for Philadelphia, once more to take his seat in Congress, far from well, after the long and fatiguing journey in what he calls the "violent heat." The poor health of the member from North Carolina prevented much active service on his return to Congress in the summer of 1779. Early in November he was confined to his bed and on the 10th of November he passed away. His death was immediately communicated to Congress and a Committee which ever since has been customary in such cases was appointed to superintend the funeral. The Committee, consisting of two fellow delegates from North Carolina, Cornelius Harnett and William Sharpe, and Cyrus Griffin of Virginia were appointed to superintend the funeral. No thought of the little ancestral burying ground at Stony Brook entered their minds. The funeral was arranged for three o'clock the next day and Congress attended in a body with black crêpe around the left arm, which by resolution of Congress they were to wear for a month. The Committee was directed to invite the Pennsylvania Assembly, the president and the supreme executive Council, the French Minister Plenipotentiary and all other persons of distinction then in town. The services were held in Christ Church with the Rev. William White the attending Chaplin of Congress officiating. The interment was made in Christ Church burial ground. His grave was never marked and

he is included in the general tablet to the Seven Signers which has been erected at the Second Street gate.

His fellow member notifying the Governor of North Carolina of Hewes's ill health said that "his complaint was bilious and consumption." His circle of friends in Edenton were profoundly moved by the news of his death, which did not reach them until a month later. "Poor Mr. Hewes," Iredell writes his wife, "I have heard an account of his death. What wretched mortals we are and what a world is this? The loss of such a man will long be severely felt and his friends must ever remember him with the keenest and most distressing sensibility. Mr. Hooper and I have most painfully sympathized in it and it has given us a shock, we have not yet recovered. I will be obliged if you will deliver his will which is in my tin box to your brother, or Mr. Smith, or Mr. Allen." And his old friend Hooper records his feelings: "He was my very intimate friend. I knew and had probed the secret recesses of his soul and found it devoid of guilt and replete with benignity. I loved him and I believe I was very dear to him but a long series of sickness had prepared his mind for the fatal stroke."

A few facts should be added to show the continuing and close connection of the Hewes family with the Society of Friends. Providence Hewes, Joseph's mother, was recommended by women Friends of Chesterfield Monthly Meeting, "to sit with Ministers & Elders," in 1767 and in 1780 she was recommended, in this capacity, to Haddonfield, N. J. Monthly Meeting. Daniel Hewes, Joseph's younger brother, died as a young man in Philadelphia and was buried in the Friends' Burying Ground. Another brother, Aaron, removed to Woodbury, N. J. continuing his membership with the Society. Josiah Hewes, who survived his brother Joseph forty-two years, on his death in 1821 left

a large fortune. He was a bachelor and had boarded for sixty two years in one household. He left considerable legacies to six nephews and nieces and to twenty-nine great nephews and nieces and eleven personal friends. But our interest is mainly in the bequests to Quaker institutions. The Pennsylvania Hospital, the Monthly Meeting of Friends in Mulberry (Arch) Street, the Almshouse in Walnut Street, Westtown School, The Female Society and Stony Brook Meeting "As a token of regard for the place of my nativity" were remembered. Of special interest was a "large china bowl which was given me by my brother Joseph Hewes" and an iron chest, silver buckles, gold stock buckle and gold headed cane, which his brother Joseph had also given him.

The only two incidents which have been frequently used to claim that Joseph Hewes was a member of the Church of England, were his reading the responses one Sunday in little St. Paul's Church in Edenton and the fact that his remains lie in Christ Church graveyard in Philadelphia. Against these are his birth in the Society of Friends, his family connections and the fact that he never relinquished his membership in that body.

In 1932 a monument erected by the United States Government was unveiled to his memory at Edenton.

New England Quakers and Military Service in
the American Revolution

Arthur J. Mekeel

X

NEW ENGLAND QUAKERS AND MILITARY SERVICE IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The years of the American Revolution were for American Quakers one of the most trying periods of their existence. In both England and America the Society of Friends since its origin had found occasion to practice its testimony against participation in war. But in the case of the mother country, wars had been carried on for the most part abroad and, when civil, were short and almost bloodless. In America the intercolonial wars had been chiefly of a frontier nature and did not assume the character of European campaigns affecting the more thickly populated areas. The same can be said of the Indian wars. The American Revolution, on the other hand, was not only a struggle against forces imported from without, but also contained the elements of a civil contest. It was of several years' duration and was waged back and forth over the length and breadth of the thirteen provinces. The need for men and money was felt as never before, and the Quakers, who were at that time a wealthy and numerous portion of the population in certain sections, could not escape the demands and requisitions which fell upon everyone. A number of vital problems had to be faced in connection with their pacifist position, but the discussion here will be confined to the question of military service and the relation of Friends with the New England governments on this subject.

The direct sequence of events leading up to the war began with the Boston Tea Party of December 1773. As a punitive measure Parliament passed the Coercive or Intolerable Acts in the spring of 1774. They went into effect in June, and about a week later the Yearly Meeting of Friends for New England convened at Newport, Rhode Island, for its annual session. In the epistle to London Yearly Meeting it indicated a realization of the stormy period of trials which lay ahead. The epistle expressed the following concern:

The Commotions arising in the British Dominions as they are in their Consequences outwardly Calamitous, may be feared are works of Divine Displeasure, and as it may prove a trying dispensation to us your Brethren in America we desire that we may be United in the bond of peace & Spirit of the Church to humbly Supplicate the God and Father of all our mercies that he would vouchsafe to preserve and keep us faithful to our principles and Sustain us in every trying Dispensation that may attend in this State of Mutation.¹

It was not till the following spring that the first clash of arms occurred at Lexington and Concord. As the first year of the war was confined primarily to New England, the Friends there were those most immediately affected. Their situation was doubly hard since their presence in one of the more strongly revolutionary sections caused many of their own members to become infected with the prevailing spirit of discontent. In their epistle to English Friends that June they felt "called on to prepare for a tryal both within and from without which will shake the foundations of all who are not Established on the Sure Rock, . . ." ² Foreseeing the impending difficulties "from the powers of this world on account of our Religious Testi-

¹ MS *Minutes* of the Yearly Meeting of Friends for New England preserved at the Moses Brown School in Providence, Rhode Island, I, 308.

² *Ibid.*, p. 312.

mony," the Yearly Meeting on the suggestion of the Meeting for Sufferings in Philadelphia appointed a committee "who are desired to take Cognizance of all grievances arising amongst us wherein any friend or friends may be affected either in personal property or in regard to our Christian Testimony aforesaid and to advise Counsel & assist as best wisdom may direct, . . ." ³ This marks the origin of the Meeting for Sufferings in New England which in addition to caring for Friends in distress on account of the war was to "view & Judge of manuscripts proposed to be printed & Correspond with the meeting for Sufferings at Philadelphia or elsewhere." ⁴

The newly formed committee soon found itself confronted with the problem of Friends in Lynn, Massachusetts, assisting in a watch. It felt that such action was "inconsistent with our Religious Principles, being mixed with, if not wholly for Military purposes, and we conceive will have a tendency to Leaven You into the prevailing Spirit thereof, . . ." ⁵ The Friends in Lynn were advised to desist, and a copy of the letter to Lynn was also sent to Friends in Salem. They were asked to extend their "particular Care . . . that those who thro' inattention may have stept aside from the Testimony of Truth, be carefully advised, admonish'd, and reprov'd, and if need be seasonably testified against, That the cause Of truth & its followers do not suffer, . . ." ⁶ A few months later the Monthly Meeting at Salem informed the committee that the situation had corrected itself as there had been an "alteration made in the matter of Watching, and Friends

³ *Ibid.*, p. 310. The letter from Philadelphia Friends is found in the *Minutes* of the Meeting for Sufferings for Pennsylvania and New Jersey, preserved at 304 Arch St in Philadelphia, II, 2.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ MS *Minutes* of the Meeting for Sufferings preserved at the Moses Brown School, I, 3.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

have not been try'd or Call'd on since on that Account." ⁷

At the Yearly Meeting held at Newport in June 1776 the organization of the Meeting for Sufferings was permanently established. Each Quarterly Meeting was directed "to nominate four Solid Judicious Friends . . . to represent their Meeting in this Committee Now termed a Meeting for Sufferings for New England, . . ." ⁸

In studying the relations of Friends with their respective governments in New England one is deeply impressed by the sincere attempt made to spare the Quakers and others with conscientious objections from suffering for their testimony against war. Even the Second Continental Congress as early as July 18, 1775 passed a resolution stating

As there are some people, who, from religious principles, cannot bear arms in any case, this Congress intend no violence to their consciences, but earnestly recommend to them, to contribute liberally in this time of universal calamity, to the relief of their distressed brethren in the several colonies, and to do all other services to their oppressed Country, which they can consistently with their religious principles. ⁹

RHODE ISLAND

At the beginning of the war Friends in Rhode Island were exempted from military service, with certain qualifications, by laws passed during the two preceding inter-colonial wars. In 1742, at the time of King George's War, a militia act was passed with a provision that

all Persons making solemn Engagement before the Governor or any Magistrate . . . in time of war, that it is against their Conscience to bear Arms at all, shall on an Alarm, appear at

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁸ *MS Minutes of the Yearly Meeting*, I, §15.

⁹ *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789*, edited by (in progress) Worthington C. Ford and Gaillard Hunt, II, 189.

the Governor's or Magistrate's . . . , either with Horses, . . . , to be employed as Scouts, Messengers, Watches, &c. or else, if they appear on Foot, that they be divided into Companies, and obey the Governors or Magistrate's Order to remove Women and Children, or sick persons out of immediate Danger, or to watch against or extinguish any Fires that may be kindled . . . ; and to do any other Duty consistent with their Religious Principles: . . .¹⁰

It is obvious that no Quaker who was consistent with his testimony against participating in war in any way whatsoever would be found complying with this regulation.

Two years later, in August 1744, the legislature passed an Act for the relief of persons of tender consciences providing that any inhabitant of the colony who took the prescribed affirmation "that his Opinion and religious Sentiments are, that on Matters relating to War he ought to be passive, and that the Practice of War, . . . , is inconsistent with his Belief as a Christian, . . ." should be "exempted from bearing Arms as a Soldier, . . ." ¹¹ However, a reservation was included that the Act did not exempt such persons "from such Duties in Times of an Alarm, as they are bound . . . to perform, . . . by the Act for regulating the Militia: . . ." ¹² Thus Friends were still subject to the indirect services required by the Act of 1742 which prescribed a fine for those failing to appear as ordered.¹³ The Act of 1744 was continued in a revision of the laws in 1767¹⁴ and the militia Act of that date made specific reference to it. Amendments to this

¹⁰ *Acts and Laws of His Majesty's Colony of Rhode Island* (Newport, 1745), p. 234.

¹¹ *MS Proceedings of the General Assembly*, V (1729-1745), 636-637, preserved in the archives at the State House, Providence, Rhode Island. This extract is taken from the *Public Laws* of Rhode Island, revision of 1767, p. 248.

¹² *Public Laws* of Rhode Island, revision of 1767, p. 248.

¹³ *Acts and Laws* (1745), p. 234.

¹⁴ See above, note 11.

militia Act were made on the approach of and during the Revolution, in December 1774, April 1775, June 1775, and December 1776. None of these amendments contained any exemptions, as the original law was considered to have covered that question.

Because of the qualified exemption Friends began to encounter difficulties at an early date. In October 1775 John Die of South Kingston Monthly Meeting suffered distraint of his property to the amount of £2 6s. when the demand was only 12s. for the failure of himself and his son to appear at training.¹⁵ The following January

Clarke Baily, by a warrant from Simeon Clarke jun. Capt'n destrain'd and took from Stephen Hoxsie a pair of fire tongs, worth *6/for a fine of John Foster, for not appearing At an Alarm, said Stephen Hoxsie being his guardian; the demand was *3/and the said Clarke Baily the same time, with his said warrant took John Hoxsie and Edward Hoxsie, sons of the aforesaid Stephen Hoxsie; & Zebulon Weaver, and committed them to goal in Kings County, for their not appearing at said Alarm, & detained them prisoners near 40 hours.¹⁶

Cases of seizure of goods and articles for the use of the army were also frequent. In such instances Friends refused to take payment for what was taken. In April 1776 Moses Brown of Providence had taken from him

by virtue of a press Warrant from Governor Cook, by Military Authority two pair Cattle, to draw Cannon to Norwich; said Moses inform'd the authority, that he could not consent, or receive pay, and tho' the authority manifested no disposition to distress friends in particular, yet the team was used for said purpose, & gone about a week, worth £3 for which (contrary to the said Moses's mind, and without his privity) his hired

¹⁵ MS *Minutes* of the Meeting for Sufferings, I, 3 (post). The records of sufferings are listed in the back of the minute book paged from back to front. These references are indicated by (post).

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4 (post).

Man took pay; to which the said Moses manifested his disapprobation to the pay Master.¹⁷

The same year there was

Taken from Daniel Cass in Richmond in New Hampshire three blankets for soldiers, by Captain Oliver Capervin, and Constan Barne, & Michael Barrows; they came in the Night time, and took one off said Cass, as he was in bed; the other two off of the beds where said Cass'es family lay; and after some time said Capervin return'd said blankets, & offered to pay the damage done to them, but said Cass refused to take it—the damage is esteemed £1 4s.¹⁸

In the latter two cases it is evident that the authorities had no intention of causing Friends undue distress and tried to compensate them for any inconvenience suffered. On the other hand, to consistent Quakers the acceptance of any payment for property requisitioned was equivalent to indirect aid in carrying on the war and thus contrary to their testimony. Their only alternative was to "suffer" submissively.

At its monthly session in July 1776 the Meeting for Sufferings felt called upon to issue a circular letter to the various Monthly Meetings advising them as to their conduct in case of such sufferings as many of them had already undergone and which many more were destined to experience. The letter enjoined them as follows:

Dear Friends, We taking into solid Consideration, that some of our brethren have already suffered in this time of Commotion, because for Conscience Sake they cannot bear Arms, or Comply with any requisitions, inconsistent with our Religious Testimony: and it appearing probable to us that more trials of that kind may be permitted to come upon our Society, to try our steadfastness on the sure foundation; We find our-

¹⁷ *Ibid*, p. 2 (post).

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 7 (post).

selves under a Concern that such as meet with these trials may manifest in every part of their Conduct, that they have Enlisted themselves as Soldiers under the Prince of Peace; for if any be so unwary as when Destraint is made, & their goods taken from them, to be caught in that Spirit, in which wars are fomented, & carried on, such instead of maintaining our peaceable Testimony, will thereby wound the Cause of Truth, Loose the reward of suffering for Righteousness sake, and bring reproach on our holy profession: Therefore we in brotherly Love, & from a Concern for the preservation of such as may be tried in this respect, earnestly press it upon such that they carefully endeavour to watch over their own Spirits, & let their words be fine and savory, seasoned with grace, not suffering the loss of these fading things to have too much place in their minds; but on the Contrary, to have an Eye to the recompense of reward, remembering that those light afflictions, which are but for a moment, work a far more exceeding, & Eternal weight of glory for them who in faithful Obedience hold out to the end.

And we further recommend that each of the said Monthly Meetings appoint a suitable Committee who may carefully Collect in due order the Sufferings that have or may happen in said Meetings, and transmit an account thereof to this Meeting, . . .¹⁹

Such advice was timely, for the Militia Act amendment of the following December boded ill for Friends. It was entitled "An Act for draughting all male persons within this state Subject by law to bear arms."²⁰ Though Rhode Island Quakers had suffered somewhat already in various ways, the initiation of a draft in place of enlistment as a means of reinforcing the army brought upon them much greater difficulties. Early in 1777 the Meeting for Sufferings

being inform'd that several Friends belonging to the Monthly Meeting of Greenwich, & else where, have already suffered,

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 46-47.

²⁰ *Acts and Resolves*, December Session 1776, p. 39.

and now lay liable to yet greater sufferings, for their noncompliance with certain late military Requisitions; after deliberate consideration thereon, & recourse had to the several acts of Government, made for the Exemption of those of tender Consciences in such Cases; It appearing notwithstanding the good Intentions of the Legislature manifested in said Acts; there are certain Requisition[s] in them so straitning to such tender Consciencious minds in general, that if put in execution, the use & end of said Acts would be almost wholly frustrated; at least, with regard to us as a Religious Society, . . .²¹

appointed a committee "to lay a Copy of this Minute before the General Assembly . . . , & to represent this Meeting in answering such Questions, and giving such further information in this matter as may appear condusive to the Establishment of Religious Liberty."²² The legislature proved amenable to their representations and passed an Act providing that

any person inhabiting within this state, and of sober life and conversation, who can, and shall frankly and freely take the affirmation hereinafter prescribed, . . . ; or if one of the people called Quakers, shall produce a certificate from the clerk of the monthly meeting to which he belongs, that he is a member of their religious society, such certificate shall excuse such person from all military duty, whatsoever.²³

It was also enacted that if any Friend had been drafted previously and was a member of the Society of Friends at that time he should "be excused from any fine incurred by [his] neglecting said duty; and if committed to Jail for the non-payment thereof, [he should] be discharged from said confinement, upon [his] producing a certificate thereof, from the clerk of the monthly meeting, [to which

²¹ MS *Minutes* of the Meeting for Sufferings, I, 60-61.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 61.

²³ *Records of the State of Rhode Island*, VIII, 1776-1779, 122.

he belonged] . . ." ²⁴ It also repealed the act passed in King George's War requiring certain duties of persons of tender consciences. ²⁵

The Meeting for Sufferings then directed a circular letter to the Monthly Meetings in the state informing them of the passage of the new laws and advising them on their compliance with it. It directed:

as Monthly Meeting Certificates are to Excuse such as produce them from all Military Duty (so called) whatsoever; great fear appeared in divers Members of that Assembly, lest some young or loose person, or persons might get excused thereby from Military requisitions, who ought not to be Indulged. Let it be remembered friends, that if we give Certificates to any whose Life, & Conversation does not well answer to our profession, we must bear the Reproach, and shall mar our Reputation as a Society; and very likely lose the Indulgence we now have, through much labour obtain'd; Therefore Dear Friends, let there be great Care to inspect the Conduct of such as require Certificates, and also their principle respecting War; and we desire that none may be granted to any others but Such who are of sober lives and Conversations, & who are clear in our Antient Testimony against wars, & fightings; and that such Certificates be Inspected & directed by, & signed in open Meeting: . . . ²⁶

But the Quaker victory was short lived. The fear of some members of the General Assembly that this provision would be misused brought a change in policy. It was claimed that "many persons . . . , have availed themselves of the act, . . . , and avoided contributing their equal and necessary proportion for the defence of our rights, . . ." ²⁷ No doubt an important consideration was the fact that the British had occupied Newport that winter and

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 128-129

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 123.

²⁶ *MS Minutes of the Meeting for Sufferings*, I, 61-62.

²⁷ *Records of the State of Rhode Island*, VIII, 204.

Rhode Island began to feel the scourge of war more directly.

The legislature's change of heart was evidenced the following April in an enactment that all persons should be drafted regardless of their position on military service or their religious affiliation.²⁸ The commanding officer in each regiment was ordered to "make return to their . . . commanding field officer, of all persons within the district of their said companies who have taken the affirmation, or produced certificates from the meeting of Friends, . . . , upon any draft being ordered . . ." ²⁹ The latter officer was directed "immediately after such draft, [to] give in a list of all persons, so drawn in each town, to the town council, . . . ; and thereupon, such town council shall depute and appoint one of their members immediately to hire so many able bodied men as . . . equal the number returned, . . . , at the expense of the persons within their respective towns, so drafted, . . ." ³⁰ In case the persons for whom the substitutes had been hired refused to pay the sum assessed, the town council was empowered "to issue a warrant of distress, . . . , to seize and distrain so much of the goods and chattels of the person or persons refusing or neglecting, as aforesaid, . . . , as shall be sufficient to pay the sum advanced to hire persons in their behalf, . . ." ³¹

On the passage of this law the Meeting for Sufferings directed the Monthly Meetings within the state not to issue certificates of membership. According to the new enactment, instead of wholly exempting Friends from military service they were to be used in proportioning the number drafted "and so are made necessary prerequisites to the

²⁸ *Ibid.*, VIII, 204.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 205.

³¹ *Ibid.*

Execution of the Law, which if admitted, would destroy the very principle on which the Original was founded: . . .”⁸² The Meeting also declared: “We desire that friends be Careful not to countenance proceedings so contrary to our Religious Rights, by taking back any . . . overplus [money from the sale of distrained goods], as thereby they will wound the Cause of Truth, depart from our testimony, and bring a Burden upon the faithful.”⁸³

The effect of this law upon Friends is indicated in the following accounts of distraints:

Account of the Sufferings of James Chase of Little Compton . . . on the 29th of ye 10th mo. 1777, there was taken from him one fat Ox, & one fat Cow, valued at 72£10^s for 31£11^s demand; by Philip Dring, Town Serjeant, by a warrant from the Town Council on account of his Son’s being drawn for a Soldier one month.⁸⁴

10th Mo. [1777] Taken from . . . Paul Greene, by John Wightman Constable, Warrant Issued by the . . . Town Council, signed by the . . . Clerk, Two Cows, & four pair of Shoes, for his not serving as a soldier, one month, when draughted; the value of the Cows & Shoes £36 Demand 30s. 10 [d.].⁸⁵

Somewhat later, in November 1777, Thomas Baker had taken from him

by Randall Briggs, Dep^t Sheriff, by a warrant issued by of the Town Council of Cranston:—Twenty Barrels of Cyder, value in the present Currency—£48 The fine demanded (for his not attending military duty (so called) when draught^d £29 8s.⁸⁶

In its epistle to London Yearly Meeting in June 1778 the Yearly Meeting informed its English brethren that

⁸² MS *Minutes* of the Meeting for Sufferings, I, 67.

⁸³ *Ibid.*

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 6 (post).

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (post).

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

The amount of friends Sufferings on acc^t of military Requisitions, bro^d up since our own meeting last year, from the Monthly meetings belonging to Rhode Island Quarter within that Government, is Two Thousand four hundred and Seventy three pounds Lawful Money in the currency as it passed at the several Times of Distraint—And it is with Satisfaction that we have to acquaint you that Friends have generally borne their Sufferings with Christian patience— . . .³⁷

The epistle of the following year, 1779, gave the amount since the previous Yearly Meeting as £3,456 and upwards, "valued as the currency was at the several times of Distraint."³⁸

In comparing these figures with those for the years 1774, 1775 and 1776 the great increase in Friends' sufferings is noticeable, even allowing for the depreciation of the currency. In 1774 the amount recorded was £4 6s. 2d., 1775 £23 12s. 7d., and 1776 £43 14s. 7d., all of which included other types of requisitions.³⁹ The same situation is revealed in the number of persons affected by distraints. In 1775 and 1776 it was twenty-five and fifteen respectively, while in 1777 and 1778 it was fifty-six and fifty-one.⁴⁰ That Friends maintained their testimony staunchly despite adverse circumstances is evidenced by the fact that only three disownments are recorded for the hiring of substitutes. Two of these were in Smithfield⁴¹ and one in South Kingston⁴² Monthly Meetings.

³⁷ MS *Minutes* of the Yearly Meeting, I, 332. The value of Continental money ranged from 100 cents on the dollar in September 1777 to slightly over 36 cents in June 1778. See Edward Channing's *History of the United States*, III (New York, 1912), 393, n. 1.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 339. Channing gives the decline in value of the Continental currency as ranging from somewhat over 32 cents on the dollar in July 1778 to a little over 6 cents in June 1779. See his *History*, III, 393, n. 1.

³⁹ MS *Minutes* of the Meeting for Sufferings, I, *passim* (post).

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ MS *Minutes* of Smithfield Monthly Meeting preserved at the Moses Brown School, II, 152, Feb. 27, 1777; p. 185, July 30, 1778.

⁴² MS *Minutes* of South Kingston Monthly Meeting preserved at the Moses Brown School, II, 72, Jan. 27, 1777.

In the fall of 1777 the Meeting for Sufferings was stirred to action by the imprisonment of a young Friend, David Anthony, of Greenwich Monthly Meeting. On 10 August "by a warrant Issued by Thomas Rice Captⁿ to Thomas Babcock Clerk, [he] was committed to goal and remained a prisoner about nine weeks, for not complying with some military requisitions, . . ." ⁴³ When the Meeting for Sufferings was informed of the situation it appointed a committee to investigate and act as seemed advisable.⁴⁴ The committee later reported it had interviewed the Lieutenant Colonel of the regiment into which Anthony had been drafted who had "pointed out no other way for his dismissal but by application to the General Assembly or the Council; . . ." ⁴⁵ The Meeting decided to ask the legislature for Anthony's dismissal "upon the principle of tenderness and regard to the Consciences, of Men, & the Antient principle on which this government was founded, and which the Legislature hath since often confirmed; . . ." ⁴⁶ The committee visited the General Assembly and reported to the Meeting for Sufferings later the same day. On receiving this report the Meeting declared that it was

well satisfied as to the good Disposition of Both houses of Assembly towards religious Liberty and such Conscientious persons—and as we are desirous that said Liberty should not be encroached upon; but freely enjoy'd by all; think it incumbent on us to Inform the Legislature that we cannot but consider said additional Act [passed the preceeding April and under which Anthony had been prosecuted] as an infringement of the Civil Rights, & Religious Liberties that Conscientious people ought to enjoy; and to move them to a repeal of the said additional act, & the Establishment of religious Lib-

⁴³ MS *Minutes* of the Meeting for Sufferings, I, 12 (post).

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 74-75. Anthony was later released by order of the Council. *Ibid.*, p. 12 (post).

erty, by letting the Consciences of Men, the government of which being the alone prerogative of god, go free; that they may thereby be found acting to his praise, which is the right Use of power and Authority; . . .⁴⁷

A new committee was appointed to obtain relief from the act in question. It approached the legislature and "endeavoured to shew . . . that said additional Act was inconsistant both with our Civil rights, & Religious Liberty; and that we could not yield active Obedience thereto;" . . .⁴⁸ A repeal of the law was requested, but when a vote was taken in the lower House the motion for repeal was defeated by a large majority.⁴⁹

Somewhat later Moses Brown corresponded with Jabez C. Bowen, a state senator, on the matter. Bowen declared he had been opposed to the Act to which the Quakers objected and had had a new one introduced into the House, but it had been defeated. Consequently the first one had had to be accepted because of the pressing affairs of government. Bowen accused Friends of obstructionist tactics in refusing to cooperate with regard to the exemptive provisions granted.⁵⁰ This attitude was no doubt characteristic of most non-Friends.

From then on the Quakers were forced to suffer for their testimony, and complete relief came only with the close of the war. However, in the following year, 1779, the British evacuated Newport, and thereafter there was less need for soldiers. In the later years of the war the problem of distraint of property on account of war taxes assumed the place of distraint for refusal to serve in the army.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 75

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, I, 76.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ Letter from Jabez C. Bowen to Moses Brown June 13, 1778 in the *Moses Brown Papers* in the Rhode Island Historical Society in Providence, Rhode Island, II, 149.

MASSACHUSETTS

Until the latter part of 1776 Friends in Massachusetts experienced little trouble with regard to military service as the legislature provided only for voluntary enlistment. But in September of that year an urgent request for military aid was received from the governor of Connecticut.⁵¹ The General Court ordered that a fifth part of the state militia not then serving, with the exception of certain counties and towns, should be drafted. If a drafted person refused to march or hire a substitute he was to be fined not exceeding £10, or imprisoned not exceeding two months.⁵²

As a result of this order three Quakers in Worcester County, William Batchellor and Francis Dudley of the town of Sutton and David Grafton of Grafton, were drafted. A petition in their behalf was sent up to the General Court stating:

That they Profess themselves Friends & Cannot in Conscience take arms on Either Side in the Unnatural War Subsisting Between Great Britton and the American Colonies or in any other Warrs Whatever Because they think it is Contrary to the Precepts of Christ as Sett forth in many Places in the New Testament and in no ways Lawful to Such as will Be the Disciples of Christ—

first Christ[’s] Command *that we should Love Our Enemies* . . . But warr on the Contrary teacheth us to Hate & Destroy them.—

2 The apostle Saith . . . *that we Warr not after the Flesh & that we fight not with flesh & Blood:* But Outward warr is according to the flesh and against flesh & Blood for the shedding of the One & destroying of the other—

3 The apostle Saith . . . *that the Weapons of Our Warfare are not Carnal But Spiritual* But the Weapons of Out-

⁵¹ *Acts and Resolves, . . . , of the Province of the Massachusetts Bay, XIX, 558.*

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 559.

ward Warr fare are Carnal Such as Cannon, musketts Spears, Swords & of which there is no mention in the Armour Described By Paul

4th Because that James Testafied that *Warrs & Strifes Came from the Lust which was in the members of Carnal men* But Christians those that are Truly Saints have Crucified the Flesh with the affection of Lusts therefore they Cannot Indulge them By Waging Warr.

5th Christ says . . . that his Kingdom is not of this world and therefore that his Servants Shall not fight Therefore Those that fight are not his Disciples nor Servants and many other Passages which are Omitted.⁵³

When the situation of the Quakers was thus brought before them, the legislature amended the act under which the problem had arisen. On November 29 it was enacted that all who had been Friends before April 19, 1775 should be exempted from the draft.⁵⁴ A committee was also appointed to consider the petition, which later recommended that the prisoners be discharged.⁵⁵

In order to acquaint itself with the number of men in the province available for military service the General Court in December 1776 ordered a census to be taken of each town. It was to include all males sixteen years of age and over, and those who had been Quakers on April 19, 1775, were to be so indicated.⁵⁶ According to this enumeration there were seven hundred and twenty-six male Quakers within the specified age limits.⁵⁷ In the district of Maine there were one hundred and thirty-three; sixty-four at Falmouth, twenty-two at Kittery, twelve at Windham, eleven at Harp[s]well, nine at Wells, eight at

⁵³ *Massachusetts Archives*, CLXXXII, 28-29.

⁵⁴ *Acts and Resolves of Massachusetts Bay*, XIX, p. 691.

⁵⁵ *Mass. Archives*, CLXXXII, p. 29.

⁵⁶ *Acts and Resolves of Massachusetts Bay*, vol. 19, p. 725.

⁵⁷ *Mass. Archives*, CLXI, *passim*. There seem to have been no reports from Sandwich, Yarmouth and Falmouth in Barnstable County where there were a number of Friends.

Sanford, four at Biddeford, and three at Gorham. Of those in the major part of the province three hundred and forty resided in the town of Dartmouth, one hundred and forty-six in Swanzev, fifty in Mendon, thirty-nine in Uxbridge, sixteen in Bolton, fourteen in Taunton, thirteen in Douglas, eleven in Boston, ten in Northbridge, and lesser numbers in Attleboro, Bellingham, Berkley, Chesterfield, Dighton, Dudley, Easton, Granby, Leicester, Norton, Norwich, Paxton, Rehoboth, Shrewsbury, Spencer, Wilbraham and Wrentham.⁵⁸ The chief centers of Quaker concentration were Bristol County where were located the towns of Dartmouth, Taunton and Swanzev; Worcester County where were Mendon, Douglas, Bolton and Uxbridge; and Barnstable County where there were Quaker settlements at Yarmouth, Falmouth and Sandwich. It was in these centers that difficulties chiefly arose.

In January 1777 a petition came before the General Court from three more Quakers of Worcester County, John Mayo and Elijah Davis of Oxford, and Jonathan Streeter of Douglas, all of whom were confined in "a crowded Loathsom goul in worcester among prisoners of war &c and our Hea[l]th Indangered by Filth & Vermin"⁵⁹ because "it Is contrary to the religion of the Blessed Jesus & the precepts he has taught to take up Arms and Use Endeavours To destroy one another & because we cannot see our Way clear to engage in the present war Unhappily Subsisting between great Britton & the American States . . ."⁶⁰ At first the Court ordered the officials responsible for the imprisonment of these Friends to appear and show cause why the petition should not be granted.⁶¹ But on

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, *passim*.

⁵⁹ *Mass. Archives*, CLXXXII, p. 10

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, CCXII, 87. This petition presented the same arguments against participating in war as were contained in the previous one from Worcester.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 87 (a); *Acts and Resolves of Mass. Bay*, XIX, p. 755.

reconsidering the matter the legislature rescinded this action declaring that

The power & duty of Select men Committees and Militia Officers respecting the Denomination of Christians called quakers are delineated and Sufficiently pointed out and that if they have neglected, abused or exceeded the same they ought to be tried therefore in the Courts of Common Law by a jury according to the Antient usage of this State and as other officers are usually tried for Malfeasance in their offices.⁶²

In this way the General Court sought to relieve itself from handling such problems by referring the matter to the ordinary channels of judicial procedure.

About this same time six Quakers from the town of Dartmouth were also called upon to serve in the army, despite the exemption provided in the Act of the preceding November. They refused to hire substitutes or pay the prescribed fine and were imprisoned for more than three months.⁶³ In April they petitioned the General Court for relief. In view of the fact that no provision had been made for distraining their property to pay the fine whereby they might be released, the legislature ordered the sheriff of Bristol County to discharge the prisoners on bond to return to jail when so directed.⁶⁴

The following August the government was still confronted with a deficiency in its quota of men for the Continental Army. A number of towns had failed to return their proportion of troops and these were ordered to complete their enlistments or drafts immediately.⁶⁵ It was also provided that all males upwards of sixteen years of age should be subject to be drafted "except Prisoners of

⁶² *Acts and Resolves of Massachusetts Bay*, XIX, 762, *Mass. Archives*, CCXXII, 106-107.

⁶³ *Mass. Archives*, CCXXIII, 201.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, *Acts and Resolves of Mass. Bay*, XIX, 879.

⁶⁵ *Acts and Resolves of Massachusetts Bay*, XX, 102-104.

War . . . the People called Quakers, . . .”⁶⁶ The government’s liberality in its dealings with persons of tender consciences, especially Quakers, is indicated in the treatment of a case of refusal to serve which arose as a result of this order.

In the town of East Hoosack, in the far northwestern part of the state, there was a community of Friends under the jurisdiction of New York Yearly Meeting. Four men, Jeremiah Smith, William Comstock, Jacob Smith and Ephraim Whipple were drafted. They claimed conscientious scruples against bearing arms but were imprisoned and informed they must approach the General Court for relief.⁶⁷ In the petition which they sent they solicited the legislature

to take this our Suffering case into your Consideration as it is puerly for fear of offending our Great Lord and master and in obedience to his Command who has Called us to follow peace with all men and Holiness without which no man Shall See the Lord: and to love enemies; and in the Sense of these things we cannot we dare not Disobey him in Taking up the carnal weapon therefore and for these reasons we Humbly Desire that you would Give us Some Releaf when you come to consider the Golden Rule to do by others as you would that others Should do unto you and not for the bare want of certificates to leave us to Suffer although we do realy believe the Principals of truth as professed by our friends: But however if you cannot Resolve at present to give us releif from this heavy burden we hope we Shall be enabled by our patiently Suffering to make it manifest to you and the world; that it is out of Tenderness of our Consciences that we cannot actively Comply with the present act of the General Court.⁶⁸

There is some confusion as to the relation of these men to the Society of Friends. An application in their behalf

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

⁶⁷ *Mass. Archives*, CLXXXIII, 263.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

from the Committee of Safety of East Hoosack stated that there were "Divers . . . persons within our townShip under the Denomination of friends (but not Members of their Society) who Profess with them, that it is against their Consciences to take up Arms Either Offensive or Defensive: . . ." ⁶⁹ A similar appeal from the Friends' Meeting in the town merely referred to them as "attenders of our Meeting." ⁷⁰ In considering the matter, however, the General Court evidently felt they were so closely connected with the Quakers as to be regarded in that category and on that ground granted them relief.⁷¹

In their petition for clemency the Committee of Safety took both a practical and humanitarian view of the situation. They declared that "as the present act of the Court Obliges us to Draught and Send them into the Army, where we Humbly Conceive they will be useless: And at home their Labour is much Wanted; and if you in your Wisdom would point out some other meathod than the present act accords us: as the Execution of it is a very Painful task to us; And Renders them Useless to Society in General." ⁷² A committee was appointed by the House to consider the matter, which reported a recommendation that the men be "Excused from any Military Service & discharged from any Duty in Consequence of a draft lately made on them." ⁷³ The militia officers and Committee of Safety of East Hoosack were accordingly directed to draft four men in place of those excused since the latter appeared to be "of the Denomination of people Called Quakers who are by Law Exempted from ye aforesaid service. . . ." ⁷⁴ It would thus seem that uncertainty as

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 265.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 264.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 267.

⁷² *Ibid.*, CLXXXIII, 265.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 266.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 267.

to the membership of these men in the Society of Friends may have been the primary cause for their difficulty.

In October, 1777, General Burgoyne surrendered to the American forces at Saratoga, New York. The British troops thus taken prisoner were to be shipped back to England as soon as possible. Their departure was delayed for many months, and in the meantime a guard was necessary. In the early part of the summer of 1778 Thomas Eddy, a Quaker of Northbridge, Massachusetts, was returned as a soldier for this service and was delivered to his company at Rutland, Massachusetts. The officer in charge received little benefit from Eddy's presence and finally informed the General Court that

He has remained here peaceably, but says he is a Quaker. That it is against his principle to take up arms, or in any way contribute to Support the war, he appears Stedfast and unmoveable in his principles—His Friends of the same persuasion have applied to me to Release him,—I do not Consider my Self otherised to do it—beg leave to relate his excuse for not Serving, viz that he is a Quaker—has joined their meeting which appears from several of that Denomination to be a fact, Towit last July he was taken into their meeting—⁷⁵

On the advice of a committee of the legislature Eddy was released.⁷⁶ In this case the provision requiring membership in the Society of Friends before April 19, 1775 was not adhered to, Eddy having been officially a member only about a year.

Thus far the provincial authorities in Massachusetts had been most energetic in seeing that no Quaker be prosecuted for refusing to do military service. As a letter of August 28, 1778 from the Meeting for Sufferings of New England to the corresponding body in Philadelphia indicated:

⁷⁵ *Ibid*, CLXXIV, 342-343.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 344.

Friends in the Massachusetts are not called upon for personal service; except a few instances, one of which, a friend who lately became a member, was drafted, . . . , and we hope, as hath hitherto been the Case of those drafted in that Government, he will be released, . . .⁷⁷

The case referred to was that of Levi Hunt of Swanzey Monthly Meeting. Here again the authorities did not insist on the prescribed date of membership as the necessary prerequisite for Friends' obtaining exemption from military service. It was, however, probably Hunt's lateness in joining the Society, as in the instance of Thomas Eddy, that caused his difficulty.

Early in June 1778 Swanzey Monthly Meeting was informed that Levi Hunt had been ordered into the army and sent to Fishkill, New York. The Meeting immediately appointed a committee to see what could be done.⁷⁸ Sometime afterward a minute was sent up to the Meeting for Sufferings informing them of the matter and stating that the committee appointed by the Monthly Meeting had made application to the commanding officer in behalf of Hunt. The officer declared he was unable to do anything as Hunt had been drafted by the Civil authority to which they must apply. However, he was allowed to come out of the army for a week.⁷⁹ The meeting for Sufferings thereupon appointed a committee to bring Hunt's case before the Massachusetts authorities and solicit them for his release.⁸⁰ The following month the committee reported it had interviewed the Council at Boston and was informed it must present its petition to the General Court which alone had the power to act. This the committee was di-

⁷⁷ MS *Minutes* of the Meeting for Sufferings, I, 89.

⁷⁸ MS *Minutes* of Swanzey Monthly Meeting preserved at the Moses Brown School, June 1, 1778.

⁷⁹ MS *Minutes* of the Meeting for Sufferings, I, 87.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

rected to do.⁸¹ Three weeks later it advised the Meeting for Sufferings it had applied to some members of the Massachusetts Assembly and sent up a memorial and petition by a member from Rehoboth where Levi Hunt lived. It had been notified that the lower house had received and granted the same, but that the matter had been dropped for the time being. Since then Hunt had been sent home by oral dismissal.⁸²

As the war progressed the problem of raising the required levies of men became more difficult, and the General Court was forced to adopt more stringent regulations regarding conscientious objectors. A change in policy was inaugurated as a result of the case of Seth Huddleston of Dartmouth Monthly Meeting. In the early part of June 1779, in response to a requisition from the Continental Congress, the legislature was asked to raise two thousand troops for the Continental Army.⁸³ No specific provision was made for the Quakers and Huddleston was drafted. On refusing to serve he was taken into custody by the military authorities, though permitted to remain at home until he could apply to the General Court for relief.⁸⁴ The Meeting for Sufferings, on being notified of the affair, presented a petition to the Court in his behalf.⁸⁵ A committee appointed by the House to consider the matter reported a resolve that he be discharged, and that if he would not pay the required fine for refusing to serve, the officer by whom he was drafted be authorized to raise the amount by distraint of his property.⁸⁶ It also proposed that a bill be introduced repealing the exemption from military serv-

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 93.

⁸³ *Acts and Resolves of Massachusetts Bay*, XXI, 38-44.

⁸⁴ *Mass. Archives*, CLXXXV, 383.

⁸⁵ *MS Minutes of the Meeting for Sufferings*, I, 110; *Mass. Archives*, CLXXXV, 383-384.

⁸⁶ *Mass. Archives*, CLXXXV, 385.

ice of those who were Quakers before April 19, 1775 and enacting that if any should be drafted in the future and should fail to serve or procure a substitute or pay a fine the officer in charge should be empowered to collect the fine by distraint of the offender's property.⁸⁷

A short time afterward the committee's suggestion was adopted. The following June, in response to requests from both the Continental Congress and General Washington, new drafts were ordered.⁸⁸ At the same time it was provided that anyone refusing to serve must hire a substitute or pay a fine, and if the latter were not paid the officer in charge could resort to distraint of property for the necessary sum.⁸⁹ Moreover, those failing to hire a substitute or pay a fine within twenty-four hours, were to be "subject to all the penalties of the laws for desertion."⁹⁰

Soon after this enactment seventeen Friends of Dartmouth and Acoakset⁹¹ Monthly Meetings in Bristol County were drafted. They were put at liberty, however, for a few days "by the lenity of the Superintendent of the County of Bristol, . . . to lay their Sufering Case before the Superior Authority; . . ." ⁹² They notified the Meeting for Sufferings of their situation, which decided to lay the matter before the Massachusetts Council as the General Court was not then in session.⁹³ The Meeting felt

encouraged to hope for and expect their Interposition herein, . . . , from the attention And Justice of that Council, in their Assistance in like cases, Consistant with the disposition of the General Court, Manifested by their Laws, and upon particular applications on account of Individuals; Wherefore we cannot

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 385-386.

⁸⁸ *Acts and Resolves of Massachusetts Bay*, XXI, 519-524; 568-572.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 520.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 521.

⁹¹ The present name is Westport Monthly Meeting.

⁹² *MS Minutes of the Meeting for Sufferings*, I, 130.

⁹³ *Ibid.*

apprehend or believe that it is the Intention of the Legislative Body at this time to Exercise Coertion upon our Bodies, to Compell us into Actions, which our Religious Principles and Consciences so well known, forbid us to be encouraged in; much less that because we do not attend the Service required, we shall not be Subject to the penaltys of the Law for desertion, . . .⁹⁴

A committee consisting of Joshua Devol, Richard Delano and Samuel Smith was authorized to present a "Remonstrance"

To the Council for ye State of the Massachusetts Now Sitting; . . . in behalf of Ourselves and Diverse others of our Religious Society, Humbly Sheweth

That Several of our Denomination Namely, Azariah Taber, Jonathan Taber, Jonathan Delano, John Howland, Joseph Tacker Jr., Elijah Russell, Henry Smith, Gideon Howland, W^m Anthony Jr., Tho^a Russell, Benj^a. Chace, Eber Davis, Edmond Tripp, Abner Potter, Stephen Cornell, Joshua Devol, and John Howland the s^d. all Inhabitants of the Town of Dartmouth in this State, being members of our Society have Lately been Called upon as Soldiers drafted for the Continental Army, in Consequence (as we apprehend) of an Act of the General Court made in Last month, and are now under the charge of the Superintendant of the County of Bristol by whose Lenity they have at present their Liberty Until the 18th instant, in order to Lay their Suffering Case before you, And there being Diverse others who have, or yet may stand Liable to Suffer Like Restraint by Virtue of the afores^d Act, according to the Construction that is put thereupon by Some of those who have the Executive power vested in them; We do therefore Lay this our Remonstrance before you, Humbly Requesting your Speedy Interposition herein So far as your jurisdiction may Extend, being Engouraged to hope for Redress in this Interesting matter from the Lenious disposition of the Council in their Assistance in time past when Application hath been made to them in like cases—

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 130-131.

We not being Apprehensive, nor do we believe it to be the Intension of Government to Exercise Coercion upon our Bodies to Compell us into Actions which our Religious Principles & Consciences so well Known, forbid us to be Engag'd in, much Less that because we "do not attend the Service Requir'd" we should be Subjected to the Penalties of the Law for Desertion, Wherefore we being here in Waiting, Earnestly Request your attention to the Premises, and Grant Such Relief as you in your Wisdom and Justice toward Tender Consciences may See meet, . . .⁹⁵

The remonstrance was read before the Council on the day of its reception and entrusted to a committee for consideration.⁹⁶ The following day the committee reported that in their opinion the muster master should not have mustered anyone of the denomination of Quakers and should have collected a fine of £150 for refusal to serve or hire a substitute as directed by law.⁹⁷ They also submitted a letter to that effect for the muster master of Bristol County, which was accordingly sent.⁹⁸

The muster master's reply to the Council's letter pointed out the difficult position in which those towns with a large Quaker population were placed in raising their quotas of men. It is hardly to be wondered at that there should have been some feeling against Friends on the part of both their fellow townsmen and the militia officers. In fact, one cannot but feel that they were fortunate in the consideration which they received. The muster master's answer declared that he had

just received a copy of a letter from the Council Bord By way of The muster Matter in Taunton By which I understand There has been application made To the Council By some Quakers in Behalf of Themselves & others who have Been

⁹⁵ *Mass. Archives*, CLXXVI, 522.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 523.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

Drafted agreeable To a resolve of The general Cort of June 5th as it appears By s^d Letter The Conduct of The officers is not Justifiable in Drafting said Quakers—For which I answer, The Resolves are very Plain and I Purpose To follow Them as Direct: if my understanding of Them is wrong I Desire To Be enlightened—The Persons who Complain . . . need not reflect as if There is Parshality asked in relating That while some are retained as soldiers The others have not The fines collected of Them:—in This matter There will be a strict Justice Done—The Hon^l Council Remind That the Capasaty of The mind is of equal importance in forming The soldier with That of the Body: which I am fully sensible of: I Can not Conceive where the general Cort Expected The officers Could find so great a number as is required— (from the Town of Dartmouth) with Their minds fully accomplished for soldiers when more than Half The number of The male inhabitants There . . . :—had rather submit To Be Trampled on Like The meanest Reptile Than by a vigorous Exertion To Defend himself: The Council Desired To have The officers Reminded That by The resolve aforesaid where any man refuses To attend The service another shall Be Drafted or provided in his Room “—but only [an] inferior porportion is willing to serve & [it is] unfair” To level The proportion again (on This inferior number) of a superior number who will not Contribit Their mite to Defend The Just wrights of mankind and who Even Deny The first Law in nature.—. . . Therefore I Desire The general Cort will Condescend To separate This Burdensome Class of men from The Militia, in such a manner as Their wisdom shall Direct. and not Compell Them to Bare The Burden of any Class of men whose Conduct renders Them so unworthy To have such favours Shone.—⁹⁹

But despite the feelings of this officer the complaining Quakers were released.

At the same time similar difficulties were being experienced by the Quakers in Barnstable County on Cape Cod, at Falmouth, Yarmouth and Sandwich. In a letter enclosing the returns of men mustered from Barnstable County

⁹⁹ *Mass. Archives*, CCII, 345-346.

a militia officer declared that "The hardships of getting men among Quakers is inconceivable & what makes great uneasiness I cannot say unjustly."¹⁰⁰ The Council was asked to excuse the county from the levy originally set.¹⁰¹ Later in the year the town of Rochester in Bristol County complained to the General Court that six of the ten men drafted were Quakers and so did not pass muster. It requested that the town have its quota cut from six to five men, but this was not granted.¹⁰² Such instances make it obvious that the very size of a large Quaker community was a strong reason for the difficulties of its members.

A month after the sending of the letter from Barnstable to the General Court some Friends in Yarmouth, Falmouth and Sandwich were drafted. They appealed to the legislature for relief. The petitions from Yarmouth¹⁰³ and Sandwich¹⁰⁴ were identical and explained that their refusal to serve was

not out of obstancy or In Contempt of Authority but Realy and Singly from a Conscientious Scruple and a firm Perswasion that Wars and Larning of War & Blood Shed Is Against the Command of Christ Which principle has bin held Ever Sence We Was a Society Still Remns all Which We Submit to your Consideration With Pleasing Hopes that you in your Wisdom Will find out Some Way for our Relief . . .¹⁰⁵

The militia officer in Sandwich sent a covering letter with the petitions stating that the Quakers concerned could not be

marched unless by force, and if forced to Camp I do not Suppose they would be active in a single particular: nor do I

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 348.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, CCXXIX, 415, and reverse of MS.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, CLXXVI, 254.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 255. The petition from Falmouth is found in *Ibid.*, pp. 253-254.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 255.

think it will be practicable here to get any Body to have any Hand in dragging them off against their Consciences. it was with reluctance the Officers drafted them, but the resolve makes them as liable as others, and the Towns here are calld upon for men by the three resolves . . . in proportion to their Polls Quakers included, which makes Such uneasiness among sd poor distressd inhabitants this way that to draft of the non quakers much more than their proportion would be drawing the cords so as to break— . . . the quakers drafted are less than their proportion according to Numbers, . . .¹⁰⁶

It was not the Quakers alone who were in a difficult position, for their neighbors objected to bearing the brunt of their refusal to serve and at the same time would have nothing to do with forcing Friends to do so. This in turn put the militia officers in a trying situation.

The committee appointed by the Council to consider the matter reported their decision that

the aforesaid persons being of that denomination of Christians called Quakers, ought not to have been draughted, by virtue of the resolves of the General Court of June . . . last, And that the Officers who draughted the aforesaid persons, Ought to have procured a like number of Able Bodied Men, from Each of the Towns aforesaid . . .¹⁰⁷

It also recommended a letter to be sent to the officer in charge of the first regiment in Barnstable County informing him that

a Representation hath been made to this Board, by Hattiel Killey, David Killey Jun. Joseph Killey & John Killey, inhabitants of Yarmouth, Cornelius Hoxie, John Wing, Barnabus Hoxie, Gideon Hillard, John Wing Jun^r, Joseph Wing Jun^r, Joseph Wing, Abraham Swift, Ebenezer Wing ye 3^d, Paul Wing, Issac Hoxie, Bennet Wing & Benjamin Wing in-

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid* , CLXXI, 250.

¹⁰⁷ *Mass. Archives*, CLXXI, 248.

habitants of Sandwich; Silvanus Swift, Paul Swift, Zacheus Gifford, Daniel Bowerman, Prince Gifford, Joseph Bowerman, Jun^r, Thomas Bowerman, inhabitants of Falmouth, Who Say they are of the denomination of Christians Called Quakers, and that they have been draughted, as Militia Soldiers to Serve in the Army by virtue of resolves of the General Court . . . , but their Consciences forbid their Acting as Soldiers;

And . . . this Board . . . are of Opinion that the persons before named, are not proper Subjects, for the draught aforesaid, And that you use your best discretion, in ordering your Officers to draught agreeable to the aforesaid resolve, . . .¹⁰⁸

After the adoption of a new constitution early the following year, 1780, the legislature passed "An Act for forming and regulating the Militia within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts."¹⁰⁹ This provided that Quakers should be exempted from the training band and alarm list¹¹⁰ both of which were the basis of the militia. It was further enacted

That all that Denomination of Christians called Quakers, shall be exempted from personal Military Service, subject nevertheless to pay their full Proportion of all Expences for raising Men for Military Service, either in whole or by Detachments, said Proportion of Expences to be assessed by the Assessors . . . , and to be collected in the same Manner as other Taxes . . . ; which Sum so assessed, shall be the average Price of what the Men raised in such Town shall cost, together with an Addition of *Ten per Centum*, to defray the Expence of raising Men; . . .¹¹¹

This was the method finally settled upon by Massachusetts to handle the problem of Quakers in their midst in time of war. Thereafter Friends were primarily concerned

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid* , pp 248-249.

¹⁰⁹ *Acts and Laws Passed by the Great and General Court . . . of Massachusetts*, (Boston, 1781) , chap. XXI, pp. 32-43.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 33, 38.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

with the payment of taxes for prosecuting the struggle which, however, is a subject aside from this discussion. But it was only a year and a half before the active part of the war was over, and in the meantime it was confined mostly to the southern states.

Outside of Massachusetts and Rhode Island the Friends of New England do not seem to have constituted the same problem as in those two states. In Connecticut there were practically no Quakers. In New Hampshire there was one Monthly Meeting, at Dover, and scattered groups of Friends elsewhere at Weare, Rochester, Gilmanton, Kingston, Richmond and Nottingham.¹¹² This province, however, was far from the scene of war after the British evacuated Boston in the spring of 1776 and probably did not feel called upon to take the same measures as did other states. There seems to be no record of Friends suffering in New Hampshire on account of required military service. Shortly after independence the legislature passed an "Act for Forming and Regulating the Militia" which provided that Quakers were to be exempted from the training band.¹¹³

The actions of Rhode Island and Massachusetts seem to have been prompted by a sincere regard for religious freedom and more specifically for Friends' principles. But at the same time they were forced by the exigencies of war to resort to measures which they would not have taken under less pressing circumstances. In its consideration for the conscientious scruples of the Quakers against bearing arms the Puritan Commonwealth went far toward redeeming itself for the treatment accorded them a century be-

¹¹² Vera M. Butler, *The "People of God Called Quakers" in New Hampshire*, MS thesis presented for the degree of Master of Arts at Columbia University, 1924, p. 70, *Documents and Records Relating to the State of New Hampshire*, vol. 8 (1776-1783), *passim*.

¹¹³ *Laws of New Hampshire, 1776-1784*, (Bristol, N. H., 1916), IV, 39-40.

fore. Many of the cases of suffering there arose through uncertainty or recentness of membership, and the General Court when appealed to was always willing to grant the fullest remedy possible. In the later years of the war the need for men and the difficulties of towns with large Quaker populations in fulfilling the drafts ordered probably prompted the more stringent legislation. Nevertheless, the authorities did all in their power to alleviate the distress of those Friends on whom the law operated.

In Rhode Island the course of events was much the same as in her northern neighbor. One might have thought that the presence of a large and influential Quaker element would augur the most liberal treatment, and for a short time this was the case. But the very fact of their numbers eventually embarrassed Friends, as it had in certain sections of Massachusetts. Considering the apparent loyalist sympathies of the Newport Quakers, and the hardships that the rest of the population endured, it would seem that the government acted as generously as the circumstances would permit. Many felt, as did Senator Bowen, that the refusal of Friends to take advantage of what exemptions were offered was mere obstructionist tactics.

In viewing the situation of New England Friends during the American Revolution from the vantage point of a century and a half, and from a period in which there seems to be a real threat to the freedom to maintain the integrity of conscience and peculiar "testimonies," especially in case of war, one is inclined to feel that the Quakers might have fared much worse.

Quakerism and Home Life:
An Eighteenth Century Study

Isabel Grubb

XI

QUAKERISM AND HOME LIFE: AN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY STUDY

The story of the early days of Quakerism is inseparably connected with that home at Swarthmoor Hall where the whole household was stirred by the message of George Fox. Margaret Fell and her daughters, by their generous hospitality, by their care of those in prison and of traveling preachers, by their practical oversight of the details of domestic life, set an example which has been worthily followed by succeeding generations of Quaker housewives. The influence of their homes has done much to strengthen the spiritual life and fellowship of Friends in the last two and a half centuries, and has helped to spread the truths for which they stand.

The family is a group in which people older as well as younger can learn in a limited sphere the social adjustments which will help them when facing life on a larger corporate scale, whether that of the school, the city, the country, or the world. Quakerism has much in common with the spirit which animates a well-ordered family, as indeed it should have, when we think of the value which Christ placed on the home and the position He gave to women. How eagerly, as He moved about the country, must those who knew Him have welcomed Him as their guest—women like Martha wanted to give Him of their best, and children would run to greet Him and to climb on His knees. In the spirit of their Master the “first pub-

lishers of Truth" penetrated into the homes of seventeenth-century England. Sheltered for the night in some friendly household they would leave behind them knowledge of the Seed which not alone brings new life to the individual but which can also produce a more ordered corporate life. Prophetic fervor and missionary activity drew these preachers away from their own homes; fathers and even mothers might be absent for months together either spreading the news or in prison for their testimony to it. Yet the remaining members of the family would bravely carry on their daily occupations, often in spite of much persecution. Not enough tribute has yet been paid to the women of early Quakerism. They were sometimes the breadwinners and business heads of the household as well as the housewives and mothers. Mary Penington tells how she had to undertake the task of building a house for her husband and family, and how her mind "was daily turned towards the Lord in conducting this affair." She continues, "I set all things in order of a morning before I went to meeting, and so left them unthought of till I returned; rarely finding them so much as to rise in my mind when going to, or when at meetings. Thus was my mind kept sweet and savoury; for I had nothing in all that affair that disquieted me, having no further anxiety than that nothing should be wasted. . . . I lay down sweetly and very pleasantly at night, awaked with a sweet sense of the work before me in the morning, was employed all day thereat, but had no burden on my mind." What confidence she had in her Divine Guide when thus busy with household cares with her husband in prison and greedy men trying to deprive her of her property!

William Edmundson, in his testimony to his wife, who died in 1691, says, "When I was called to travel in the service and labour of the gospel of our Lord and Saviour

Jesus Christ she never opposed me but gave me up, and with all readiness would provide things necessary and suitable to my journey whether in this kingdom or in foreign countries to make things as easy to me as she could, and my labours without charge to others; I was three times in the West Indies in truth's service and the last was a year and a half from her, and my expense much, which she knew was supplied mostly by her endeavours, and I never heard her mention the charge in way of reflection, but on the contrary if my occasions were answered that I did not want, it was satisfaction to her, she took the charge of our outward concerns and family upon her in my absence, and stood in her testimony against tithes, and the Lord increased things under her hand beyond ordinary."

These two examples must suffice for early Quakerism; for the period in which I believe one can study Quaker home life most clearly is that at the close of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth. By that time Friends had had some degree of toleration for nearly a hundred years. They had settled down as of the "quiet of the land." They had worked out a somewhat elaborate and severe code of rules known as *The Discipline* with regulations which affected them as individuals and also in their families and households. The testimony for simplicity which they upheld influenced individual dress, language and behaviour, and also the furnishings of their houses and the kind of hospitality shown. Yet it must be remembered that many Friends did not conform in these matters and for them attendance at meetings for worship was their principal link with the Society. These people mixed socially with their contemporaries and were sometimes known as the gay Friends. Very many of them were disowned for marrying outside the Society or for similar causes.

It is of the stricter Friends I wish to write, those to whom the peculiar dress was as much a uniform as that of the soldier and as much a symbol of separateness as that of the nun. These families tended more and more to become a carefully guarded community. In the garden walled in by *The Discipline* spiritual flowers blossomed and bore fruit, producing some of the finest traits of the Quaker character, and some too which we may regret. The Discipline, promulgated and upheld by the business meetings of the Society, was almost personified by its strictest adherents; its restraining and constraining influence was felt in every department of home life. From the cradle to the grave each loyal member of the organization had to be amenable to it.

In *The Faith and Practice of the Quakers*, Rufus M. Jones has spoken of "the large array of ordinary unnamed Friends who had no fame and no publicity, but who were saints in the farm-house and leaders of light and truth in their communities by the sheer strength of their inward life and by the simplicity and spaciousness of their souls." It is from the lives of such Friends I would draw most of my illustrations, from the generation of Friends who were beginning to take interest in matters outside the Society at a time when the strength of its spiritual life was increasing after the low level it had reached about the middle of the eighteenth century. These Friends were, for the most part, a middle class community—bankers, traders, merchants, shopkeepers, millers, farmers, and a few educationalists. With them were Quaker servants, apprentices and clerks. There was much difference in wealth but to a certain extent membership in the Society overrode class distinctions. Irish traders and teachers were received as guests in such princely houses as those of the Gurneys, the woollen manufacturers and bankers of Norwich, yet at

home they maintained the friendliest relations with those who were very poor in this world's goods. Although most of my quotations are taken from the correspondence of the Shackletons and other Irish families, they may be considered fairly typical of Quakerism in other countries also; the link between Friends in Ireland and England was very close, and there was constant interchange of visits with America.

Richard Shackleton, the friend of Edmund Burke, and schoolmaster at Ballitore, Ireland, used to say "that talking too much about spirituals is like leaving the cork out of a bottle of spirits, the spirits get vent and evaporate and leave the liquid weak." In spite of this dictum, which is characteristic of the Quietist outlook, there was undoubtedly much moralising and giving of advice on matters of religion in the family circle and among intimates; whilst individuals indulged in minute introspection and expressions of self-abasement. Thus it is not difficult to gain from their own statements some idea of what they believed and of their spiritual experiences. In belief they were hampered by the current thought of the dualism between flesh and spirit. God was a God of mercy but He was even more a God of strict justice, and some were burdened with the fear that all their strivings to lead a right life would not in the end prove sufficient.

In experience they were mystics. The power of the presence of God and of direct contact with Him was known and desired by them, whether in meetings for worship or at other times. Great despondency unless spiritual experiences were received was most characteristic. A young woman writes "that the most trifling digression from our known duty is a great advance to the contrary, I know to be a truth, thy poor friend was never in so low a state as at

present, all good has departed from me I fear never to return. What shall I do to be saved? When I go to meeting some silly chatter always prevents the exercise of my known duty, at home I can never be quiet, if I retire from the family it avails me nothing, I cannot collect my thoughts so as to find the cause of this evil nor can I ever get into a state fit to offer up a petition to Him who alone can help me." The fear of the unknown was another depressing influence in their lives, yet they believed too "that (tho' enveloped in garments of clay) we have a very close connection with the spiritual world, and that our departed friends when they throw off the shackles of mortality still retain those sympathetic affections which united us here."

The awe and reverence with which they regarded God made them very careful to avoid using His name; they substituted instead such phrases as Divine Wisdom or Unerring Providence. Yet they consciously sought to follow a divine person, not an abstract idea. One writer comments, "In funeral sermons I have frequently heard this ejaculation May we follow her as *she* has followed Christ; to answer my idea of perfection the imitated should be but one and that one the Great Model Himself, whose minutest actions while He wore the figure of mortality were apparently meant for our directions, therefore what need is there to recommend us a deputy for an example."

Their realization of the seriousness of every part of life was closely connected with their experience of divine guidance. A housekeeper who was leaving her position to open a village shop wrote, "This I am sure of, that I sincerely desire to be directed by unerring wisdom in this and everything else of moment, and is not every step we take on our journey through this vale of tears of moment?" In this particular matter she had not relied only on her

own guidance, but had also consulted two or three weighty Friends.

As one young man put it, "Religion doth not consist in any outward traditional conformity but in power." The message of an old woman of ninety-five was, "Love God, for He is good; fear God, for He is just; pray to God, for from Him all good comes," and for the Friends of her meeting her words were "Tell them to live in love; it is a fine thing to live in love; oh, love, love, love."

The practice of private retirement and waiting on God was a constant source of strength both to individuals and to the family group. Joshua Beale writing to Mary Leadbeater says, "Does thou remember thy precious father's practice of daily retirement alone to wait on his great Master? I am often driven to this refuge and I would recommend it to thee my very dear Friend." Again, a young Friend writes, "Thou art as nothing without the Merciful Being is pleased to feed thee daily with the Bread of Life which comes down from Heaven, and which we are daily to pray and wait for to strengthen us and enable us to run with patience that heavenly race which is set before us; I hope I shall never forget what that dear friend Archey said to me the morning after we came from the Province Meeting at Limerick. While we lay in bed there came one to call me in haste and I without much thought started up in order to dress and go down. And he says unto me, 'Ben, Ben, the bread thou eat yesterday wont serve thee this day,' which words tho' short was of great service to me and occasioned me immediately to wait low and humble before the Lord and cry unto Him for the bread that feeds and strengthens the soul."

This was not the only way in which they sought spiritual food. Quaker histories and journals were much read as well as Barclay's *Apology* and other doctrinal works. The

writings of Thomas à Kempis, Madame Guion and other mystics were also favourites. Above all, their letters and sermons show how extensive was their knowledge of the Bible, a knowledge which could only have been obtained through constant reading.

More powerful aids to religious fellowship than the meetings for worship were the "Opportunities," when Friends alone with their families or with visitors would fall into silent meditation, and out of the silence would usually come exhortation from one or another. I have an account of one such family opportunity in 1789, during which six women, mostly young, spoke to the company, encouraging each other in scriptural language to be faithful. "May we endeavour," said one, "to keep our ranks in righteousness; may we lift up a standard to the people." The meeting ended with a few words from a young man and a prayer by an older woman. At other times there would be only one speaker usually a "public Friend" who was visiting the family; when he or she had spoken the company would resume conversation. On these occasions there was frequently a "speaking to conditions," when the travelling preacher gave to some definite but unknown person in the audience, warning or advice. Believing that they spoke by direct inspiration of God these men and women deprecated being made aware of facts by others. Two women Friends travelling in Ireland "mentioned their satisfaction that in the course of their labour Friends were careful not to give them any information; it would be dangerous to do so as the pure spring might thereby be stopped or mixed with this." Whilst some of the seed sown must have fallen on hard ground yet there are many records of lives changed by some word thus spoken in the quiet of the home.

Although a Quaker group might be small and the meet-

ing weak and usually held in silence, the active Friends in the community by their regular attendance at Quarterly and Monthly Meetings kept in touch with the stronger currents of life in the society as a whole. These larger gatherings were sources of spiritual fellowship and renewal and the tie which bound Friends into a very close organization. Quaker social life was intimately connected with these meetings and with the work of the Society. In addition to a good deal of intervisiting of a private nature, the circle of acquaintances and friends was increased by the hospitality shown at gatherings for church affairs, to Friends going to and from them, to travelling ministers and to others on the business of the Society. In Ireland at that time every Quaker family was periodically visited by two or three weighty Friends who commended what they found good, and reprov'd what was amiss. If there was something especially wrong the visitor might express his disapproval by refusing to eat with the family, an instance of the directness with which the Discipline influenced social relations. Many Friends took part in this work; in such duties and in the attendance at distant meetings the heads of families could spend a good deal of time away from home. This was sometimes over-zeal for church affairs, and reacted adversely on their households and children. Usually however there was some maiden aunt or elder sister or trusted Quaker servant to look after the little ones and the maids while the mistress was away.

Hospitality has always been an important mode of self-expression among Friends. In those days when travelling was slow and inns were poor, any household might be asked to entertain a traveller at night. In her diary, written in an Irish village, Mary Leadbeater often notes that Lady So and So came to breakfast, or some soldiers or

their officers had lodged in the house. In the county towns Friends had the best kept houses and were called upon to entertain judges and other officials at the time of the Assize Courts. When Prince William Henry, afterwards William IV, came to Cork, the Mayor asked the wealthiest Friend in the city to lodge him, as he could not do so himself. Friends in their own travels also mixed freely with the general public, but in the main the social intercourse was with other Friends. Sometimes hospitality was abused but more often aid was given in genuine cases of need. A sailor boy appealed to Friends in Cork, saying that his father was a Sheffield Friend, a cutler; he was sent on from one group of Friends to another, and so helped to reach home. Soon after there arrived in Cork a present of four knives from the grateful father.

Many people who are now working for better housing would be horrified at the conditions under which their own ancestors lived and thrived. One worthy Friend told a younger contemporary that "on the birth of (his) first child the nurse and child lay upon a pallet in their only chamber, the tester of their bed was covered with flax up to the ceiling, a cask of gunpowder was under the sacking bottom, and in the space between the foot of the bed and the partition wall . . . turf was piled from floor to ceiling." He added with much seriousness and grateful feelings that he never enjoyed more solid comfort and mental peace.

Even in the poorest households the duty of hospitality was recognised. At the time of a gathering like a Quarterly Meeting every bed would be filled, literally filled, and sometimes the floor occupied with sleepers as well, whilst at meals a large company would assemble. An Irish Friend, writing of London Yearly Meeting 1772, says, "Our headquarters was at our kind Friend John

Whitehead's who made our friends as welcome as ourselves." Of one twenty-four hours she writes, "I dined . . . at Richard Chester's, drank tea that evening at James Freeman's and next morning breakfasted at John Eliot's, from thence went to Thomas Corban's; at these places I fell in company with many worthy friends in whose pious conversation I felt more satisfaction than in the crowded assemblies at Gracechurch St.," (where the Yearly Meeting was in session).

Lavish hospitality was typical of all Friends but Irish Quakers seem to have gone to excesses in the furnishings of their tables and the number and variety of dishes spread before their guests. William Savery thought that some of them lived "too much like princes"; other American visitors were astonished at the sumptuousness displayed on such occasions as wedding breakfasts. In a rhyming letter which Abraham Shackleton sent to his wife to inform her that he was bringing four friends to dine, on washing day, when the oven was out of order, we find him giving the following orders for the menu—"three fat good white legged chickens," a choice shoulder of mutton with bacon and greens, apple pie, and dessert to include peaches, apples and filberts. At that time food was very cheap; it was not wasted, for in every kitchen there would be a troop of dependents of one sort or another to be fed. Personal charity was indeed one of the most practical outcomes of the Quaker faith. It was an individual concern, the loving service given to particular men and women and children, not just something organized by a committee. There was a happy freedom from committees in those days. Although poor Friends were financed by their meeting, the care for their personal needs was the duty of one or another of their fellow members.

If there was scarcity among the poor, as was so sadly often the case in Ireland, Friends were the first to shoulder responsibility. In 1793 a woman Friend started a collection for the poor in Mountmellick, an Irish village. Two men Friends "set out and among Friends and a few others got near eighteen pounds, Elizabeth Dawson being wrote to . . . sent six guineas, so cloaks, petticoats, and blankets have been furnished . . . from first to last nearly thirty pounds have been handed . . . the scholars at each school" (there were two Friends boarding schools in the village) "contributed their assistance in the working party with pleasure."

Twenty years later we learn that another country Friend "daily feeds 190 sometimes more, with potatoes, milk and broth; he had a great quantity of potatoes, of which he sells none except to his tenants or poor neighbours and to them cheap nor will he allow one to his pigs. This man is by nature fond of money, hates shew or any kind of extravagance, but in such times as the present acts his part well."

When a man got into trouble with the authorities, appeal was sometimes made to the kindness and integrity of Friends, especially when there was a fear of the death penalty; more than one owed his life to the intervention of a Quaker, and in at least one case Friends resuscitated a man after he had been hung. The following story told by Mary Leadbeater illustrates one reason why Friends were respected. It refers to the time of the 1798 rebellion in Ireland. "Pat Lyons told me that a note which I wrote to Captain Cheney on their behalf lay on the table, he saw his name therein, and he noted it to one on their trial who reckoned it from a woman, and that women did not care what they said, but on seeing the date, reckoned it was from a Quaker, and that Quakers do not tell lies on

which attention was paid to it, and Pat says it got him his liberty."

Women Friends were also in constant demand as doctors and nurses both for their own relatives and friends, and for the poor. The kitchen was an informal dispensary where medicine was given and dressings done; even yet in some out-of-the-way Quaker homes the same kind of help is given. Of Deborah Carleton her niece writes in 1778, "She was blessed with a good knowledge of physic and by experience could sometimes hit a disorder better than some physicians; though her income was scanty she gave medicines to those who were not able to pay her, and scrupled not to leave the best company to provide for the poorest wretch. All she desired was to know whether she had been of service to them; if some of them brought her a present of eggs or fowl or the like she was pleased to see their gratitude but unwilling to take it without paying. She knew where such and such lived and when riding out would stop at their cabins to enquire how they were." The care of the poor was not confined to their physical needs. In the years before and after 1800 little groups of poor girls were gathered together and taught reading and sewing. Joseph Lancaster and his educational system also found warm supporters amongst Friends.

Philanthropy towards the close of the eighteenth century became more than merely local. Even in the remote parts of Ireland Friends interested themselves in the campaign against slavery at a time when to consider any matter not directly affecting Friends in a meeting for discipline was thought to be out of keeping with the occasion. At the women's meeting of the Quarterly Meeting at Moate in the centre of Ireland in 1793, "Jane Watson, speaking not as a minister, said she was pleased to see scruples" (evidently with reference to the use of sugar) "arising amongst

us in this land, if they would tend to relieve the oppression of our fellow creatures, but wished us to be consistent and mentioned the use of cottons and calicoes which so much prevails, and which are even brought into meetings; she understood that in gathering and picking the cotton the negroes suffered as much oppression as in most employments . . . she recommended the use of woollen manufacture according to the practice of our ancient Friends, which would save much trouble in washing." Yet while Friends approved of her remarks they were not thought suitable to be recorded on the minutes of the meeting.

Quaker girls were taken into households and trained as competent domestic helpers. When family visits were paid by public Friends special attention was directed to the Quaker servants in the home. Some of these maids themselves became famous as preachers. They were treated as members of the family and the affection between them and their mistresses was often close. It must have been awkward, however, when Sally the mother's helper and Sarah the mistress both wanted to be absent on Quaker business at the same time. Weighty Friends had to suggest that Sally's gift should not be suppressed.

Although fathers and heads of households might be and sometimes certainly were most autocratic, and mothers and daughters delicate, fretful and weak-spirited at times, there was a real wealth of affection between members of the family, in which servants and visitors shared. Husbands and wives, parents and children expressed their love for each other freely. A father returning to Ireland from England decided to travel a much longer way round to see his sons at school at Worcester; writing to his wife to tell of his decision he adds, "I can stay but one night with them, however by that I shall be able to bring my pet fresher advice from the place where her chief treasure in

England is." The use of endearing terms and pet names was not confined to members of the immediate family; even well known ministers were Molly or Sam, Abby or Betsy to their contemporaries.

It would certainly be a mistake to think of these Friends as long-faced puritanical men and women who cut gaiety out of their lives. Clarkson says they enjoyed more real happiness in their homes than their contemporaries did, and this seems confirmed by their own accounts. Here are two pen pictures of happy groups. An English correspondent writes to a member of the Shackleton family in 1775:

The idea of all your persons and the place of your abode is at this instant so perfect in my remembrance that I was almost fancying myself sitting in the parlour left hand window seat, thou by my side, thy dear mother in her usual spot, mending a sheet, and saying something to us which justly caught all our attention, but she is interrupted by the welcome arrival of thy dear aunt Carleton, sister Peggy, and Sally Hall; the latter having stepped over to the Retreat to endeavour to prevail on the two former to join us; Sally's native sweetness is heightened by the success of her embassy; in short we all look pleased and feel comfortable, but still we are made more so by the approach of thy dear father who is just let loose from school and enters the room with his wonted smile and look of approbation, and a "So, so, here is a fine gathering of you, am I to find you all a dinner?"

Again, here is a description of holiday experiences in 1783:

We were a comfortable little society at Rostrevor, but the confinement of small lodgings, seeing each other going to and fro and sometimes in the sea, huddled men and women so together that we grew very bold. I do not know what Sally would say if she saw us drying our hair before the men, or me putting on my night cap in the room with Cousin William, or

more than all that walking through the town with our shifts under our arms, but remember we had our bathing dresses on and clothes over. Well, one day, I said thus, and I think I said to the purpose, Now if we had committed a fault and were sentenced for that fault to get up at six o'clock out of our warm beds, put on woollen clothes next to our skin, walk almost half a mile (strangely wrapped up in one thing or another) to the great monstrous sea, strip on the cold naked shore and plunge in amid the waves; after undergoing this be permitted to refresh ourselves with a hasty breakfast, only to encounter new perils, condemned to climb to the highest of those lofty mountains, overtaken in showers, sinking in bogs, panting for breath and wet to mid-leg now would we not think this punishment very severe, yet all this did we endure for our pleasure, and I dare say would do it, if it were to do, again.

In the long winter evenings when outdoor pursuits could not be followed, whilst most of the women would be engaged in needlework of various kinds, one of the company would often read aloud. The books chosen were not by any means only religious. Most of the good current literature, other than novels, found its way soon after publication into well-to-do Quaker households, and was willingly lent from one family to another. At the end of a letter dated 1801 comes this interesting note: "We have not heard of any more Anthologies being published. But a new name has appeared to two books, which I am inclined to think fictitious—William Wordsworth—they are much such as have appeared in the Anthologies and Southey's." Nowadays one does not think of Wordsworth's name as a possible *nom-de-plume*.

Letter writing was one of the favorite occupations of the more cultured Friends. It was not undertaken lightly but was looked upon as a form of literary composition based on what were then considered to be the best models. The following extract from a long description of an evening

walk illustrates the kind of style favoured: "The spot afforded a most delightful prospect, and the water before us, so unruffled and beautifully reflecting the shadows of trees and people passing, formed a pleasing scene—Cynthia rose in pale splendour which was soon obscured by an envious cloud."

Friends, both men and women interested themselves in science especially in botany and astronomy. Abraham Shackleton (the second) as a young man got an electrical machine which at first was looked upon as merely a fascinating toy, but he made experiments with it, and as early as 1793 his step-mother was trying an electrical treatment for her rheumatism.

The solving of riddles and enigmas was also a favorite social pastime; a strong belief in the significance of dreams provided also topics for letters and conversation. The writing of poetry of very varying degrees of merit gave a great amount of pleasure and many indulged in it. Out of doors riding and walking were favourite recreations, whilst gardening may be said to be a hereditary occupation for Quaker women. The girls made themselves "bowers" and older and younger exchanged plants with each other. A young woman of twenty writing to her sister in 1811 says:

A few days ago I walked down to my garden and was very much surprised to see it blooming as if it were only September instead of October. I pulled a nosegay for M. Pike and scribbled a few lines to send with it, which, though below par, I am tempted to send thee.

Accept my friend, this nosegay rare,
For here the flowers of spring we see,
A bunch of violets, sweet and fair,
Though not so fair or sweet as thee.

And here is summer's glowing child,
Blushing and fresh, a budding rose,
And wallflower bright and mignonette
To thee will all their sweets disclose.

And Mary dear, reared by thy hand,
Behold this balmy, blooming pea,
Which though transplanted to my bower,
Bends ingrate; to be plucked for thee.

October's winds have stripped my bower,
Yet there thy gillflower blows,
For thee I've culled its purple flower,
And it to greet its planter goes."

Some of the wealthier Friends had elaborate and highly artificial gardens. An Exeter Friend tells of her brother's grounds with three gardens rising one behind the other, a pond with gold and silver fish, an aviary for canaries, a greenhouse containing lemon and citron trees. She adds, "In a large globe in the parlour . . . we keep seventeen fish of different colours and sizes . . . thou canst hardly think what a satisfaction I take in looking at them; their constant motion and seeming cheerfulness without noise seems to me an emblem of innocence and peace." This habit of moralising over simple experiences was common. Another friend writes to her mother: "The weeds appearing after the rain, we thought best to get Margaret to pluck them up before they got too deep a root, I wish we were as careful of our own hearts to weed up every pernicious plant in its infancy, and like true weeders to pull up root and all, may we be concerned to look to the good husbandman for strength to do so."

The lack of mechanical appliances caused women to spend much more time over necessary household tasks than now. Spinning and weaving, knitting, laundering

and plaiting were occupations which were part of the duties of the daughters and maids as well as the more ordinary work of the house. One girl of nineteen whilst her mother was from home had the care of the household, the post-office, and her small sisters; this is how she describes her day's work:

I rise about half past six, arrange the letters, get breakfast in the parlour and oversee the same in the kitchen, skim the milk, see the new milk strained up, bring in the key of the dairy, and eat my breakfast, wash up the teathings, put them by, see Anne do out the parlour, hear Sarah and Lyddy their lessons, etc., set them to work, see about dinner, and sit down to work till one, when the men come in "with the postbags" help them, get Anne to lay our cloth, have dinner brought in and eat it, send out the bags, so to work again till teatime, get tea, drink it, skim the milk again, see the new strained up, give out milk for the men's supper, go into the garden or sew or read, or knit till night, get our own supper, eat it, see that doors and windows are all secured, fire out, etc., go to bed and sleep soundly.

Children had a happy time; the girls helped with the housework from an early age, but had time over for school, gardening, walks and plenty of romps; even dressing up was not excluded. At the Shackletons' school at Ballitore the boys were ardent gardeners and had their own plots; they were taken long rambles and were allowed to have pet animals at school; they were not always above bird-nesting and orchard robbing! Nor must we omit from among the members of the Quaker household the birds and animals,—parrots, canaries, dogs, cats, and, out of doors, goats, horses, etc. They had their own names and their individualities were recognised. The dogs were "dipped" as well as the babies; for these Friends, both men and women, had a great belief in the virtues of bathing,

whether in a tub, in a river, or in the open sea. One writes of his grandchildren, "Bess is a fine girl used to the cold bath, so are Aby's three, they are well, and dipped to keep them so—that is the case with myself—like good Musselmen we deal much in ablution here."

In spite of the difficulties, dangers, and slowness of travel, Friends moved about freely, sometimes by coach or canal boat, or, if able to afford it, by chaise or on horseback. Poorer Friends went on foot. Sometimes men and women rode single, sometimes the woman would ride on a pillion either behind a man Friend or the servant who went with them to bring back the horses. A swift horse might be the means of saving its master from robbery or even death, for the roads were the haunt of highwaymen especially in lonely parts. In these days of comfortable easy travel it is hard to realise the physical strain many of these delicate women underwent to attend, and attend regularly, meetings for worship and discipline, although the weather might be too hot or too cold or too wet for ordinary travel, and the roads always bad. We read in one diary of women Friends almost blown off their horses by the force of the wind, and in another of a woman who drove thirty miles in a mule car to attend Quarterly Meeting, though the snowstorm was so severe that hired chaises would not venture out. When she arrived she was so covered with snow that they could scarcely get her off the car, but because she had had the shelter of an umbrella she did not "express herself much incommoded."

An ancestor of my own, a widow with small children, reproached herself sharply for having once missed midweek meeting, although she had to walk seven miles to it, and seven back.

The work in the house was closely connected with that in the shop or on the farm, and a woman who carried the

burden of household responsibility had also often to oversee her husband's workpeople when he was absent, and mind the shop for him. Thus the influence of the home spread to customers and employees. A poor woman coming in cold and wet to purchase some small thing might be brought into the parlor to be warmed, dried and fed. An old servant on her deathbed would be cared for as one of the family.

The deeply religious principles on which Friends based their lives can naturally be seen most clearly in their reactions to events of birth, marriage, and death. They considered deathbed scenes of highest value, and in describing them sometimes entered into details which we should think morbid and revolting. Dying sayings even of insignificant people and children were taken down and widely distributed. Yet many of these accounts do give one the sense of the consciousness of the divine presence to which indeed definite reference is sometimes made. Children became familiar with the awe-inspiring nature of death from their early years. If one of the family, however young, was dying, friends and relations would be gathered round the bed to listen to anything he had to say and to kiss him farewell. Smallpox carried off many a baby from its sorrowing parents. Of one such death the mother writes "His spirit was released from its little mansion, to, we may believe, where no sickness, pain or suffering can reach, to the bosom of his heavenly Father to whom we resign him as he was lent to us by Him."

Marriage and the preparations for it were taken very seriously; the publicity and ceremony which accompanied all courtship must have been trying for the young couple. When a man decided to ask for a girl he would approach some older friend to act as intermediary, a visit to parents or guardians would be arranged, the matter would be dis-

cussed by uncles and other relatives and acquaintances, and the young woman would probably be informed by one of her parents before the suitor got a chance of asking her himself. After that the woman would take some time to consider the proposal and would seek the advice of her own friends. All was done under a strong sense of divine guidance, and of the solemnity of the marriage engagement. Before the ceremony itself the couple had to visit the men's and the women's meeting for discipline, state their intentions, receive advice, and appear a second time a month later to obtain leave to get married. On the later occasion overseers were appointed to insure that the wedding festivities were kept within bounds. These presentations as they were called were often as elaborate as the wedding itself.

Clarkson was surely justified when he stated that one of the causes of Quaker happiness was plenty of occupation and another the pleasure they found in domestic life. Having said that in the fashionable world men and their wives pursued their pleasure independently, he goes on, "But this is not the case with the Quakers. The husband and wife are not so easily separable. They are remarked as affectionate. You will never hear of intrigues among them. They are long in each other's society at a time, and they are more at home than almost any other people." One might add to this that Quaker men and women were more on a plane intellectually than were others. The equality between the sexes in matters of worship and discipline had a distinct bearing on home life. Women travelled as well as men and were even more frequently recorded as ministers. They conducted their own meetings for business and wrote their own records. Clarkson says about this fact that:

The execution of these and other public offices . . . gives them a new cast of character. It imparts to them a considerable knowledge of human nature. It produces in them thought and foresight and judgment. It creates in them a care and concern for the distressed. It elevates their ideas. It raises in them a sense of their own dignity and importance as human beings which sets them above everything that is little and trifling and above all idle parade and show.

Before passing from this period I want to give glimpses of two well-known Friends in the home, one in his own, and the other as a visitor. Samuel Neale was the most noted Irish Quaker minister in the second half of the eighteenth century. Here is a sketch of his home.

His dwelling is a small walk from the city of Cork, it is neat and elegant, and commands a delightful prospect, . . . his wife, a pleasing sensible religious Friend. Samuel (as a bishop should be) is given to hospitality. The pleasantness of his dwelling, but more especially his agreeable, cheerful edifying conversation, brings many persons from the town to visit him, and on a first day evening there is generally a religious opportunity at his house, where the young visited plants are watered by gospel showers.

Again, a letter from Lancaster in the autumn of 1772 says:

Doubtless you have heard of John Woolman's decease. . . . He was at this weekday meeting, he left the town that afternoon—after dinner Cousin Molly Bradford and I went to Cousin Dillworth's to see him—we had not sat long before he appeared (i.e. spoke) very beautifully indeed and very encouragingly, glad were we that we went—he chose to walk, he was very particular in his dress he wore coarse cloth-like flannel, no cuffs to his coat, a drab hat, a coarse unbleached shirt, no stock or neckcloth, white woollen stockings, shoes uncurried, the native colour tied with the same, he drank no foreign liquors or tea, he did not choose to drink out of

silver, or to make use of silver spoons, herb tea sometimes he drank sweetened with honey, sugar he never chose, he was indeed a striking pattern of temperance and humility.

Quaker housewives would have been sadly disappointed if all their guests had been as abstemious as John Woolman. They brought the art of home life to a high pitch because they realized the spiritual values underlying it. The Quaker home life which I have tried to sketch continued well into the nineteenth century and in some out-of-the-way places to the generation just passed.

Perhaps the most attractive pen picture of it is found in Whittier's *Snowbound*; the whole atmosphere of the poem is that of the well ordered happy family sharing its joys and comforts with others. True types of Quaker women are the "dear aunt"

Who, lonely, homeless, not the less
Found peace in love's unselfishness,
And welcome wheresoe'er she went,
A calm and gracious element,
Whose presence seemed the sweet income
And womanly atmosphere of home.

And the elder sister:

A full rich nature, free to trust,
Truthful and almost sternly just,
Impulsive, earnest, prompt to act,
And make her generous thought a fact,
Keeping with many a light disguise
The secret of self-sacrifice.

The same realization of the beauty of Quaker home life is seen in *The Pennsylvania Pilgrim* and other poems of Whittier.

Many of us find it impossible to estimate the blessing of such homes in our own upbringing. Yet customs have

changed rapidly; increased facilities for getting about, for public amusement and recreation, social activities and many other influences have led to a serious change in the homes of our own day. Children and young people too often tend to use their parents' house merely as a hotel, whilst the family is no longer the unit of social and religious life. Is it too late to recapture and to develop under present conditions those features of the Quaker home which have done so much for the building up of Quaker life and character?

The Quaker Contribution to the Old Northwest

Harlow Lindley

XII

THE QUAKER CONTRIBUTION TO THE OLD NORTHWEST

The contribution of the Society of Friends to the development of the Old Northwest is worthy of consideration at any time. As the nation's attention is now being directed to the organization and settlement of this region which took place just one hundred and fifty years ago, a survey of the Quakers' part in its development seems especially in order.¹

THE PLANTING

The first direct contact of Friends with the Old Northwest, so far as we have positive proof, was in 1773, just ten years after Great Britain had secured title to the territory from France. Two Friends, members of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, Zebulon Heston and John Parrish, prompted by a desire to make a religious visit to the Delaware Indians who had moved westward into the eastern part of what is now the state of Ohio, spent about ten weeks making a trip in order to express their interest in the welfare of these first Americans.

The first Friends' minister to cross the Ohio River and preach within the limits of the Northwest Territory was Thomas Beals who was born in Chester County, Pennsyl-

¹ Most of the material used in the preparation of this chapter has been obtained from publications, newspapers and manuscripts in the possession of the author.

vania, in March, 1719, the son of John and Sarah Bowater Beals. From John and Sarah are descended a very large number of members of the now widely extended Yearly Meetings, Indiana, Western, Iowa, and Wilmington, as well as of Yearly Meetings west of the Mississippi river. Among them are to be found many outstanding ministers in the Society of Friends. The Beals family migrated from Pennsylvania to Maryland and later to Virginia. Thomas Beals moved with this family to North Carolina in 1748, or 1749, living about thirty years in the then frontier communities of Cane Creek, New Garden, and Westfield, during which time he paid several lengthy visits to the Indians.

In the year 1775, twenty years before Wayne's Treaty with the Indians at Greenville, Ohio, Beals, accompanied by four Friends, started to pay a visit to the Shawnee Indians and some other tribes. After passing a fort not far from Clinch Mountain in Virginia, they were arrested and carried back to the fort to be tried for their lives on the charge of being confederates with the hostile Indians. The officers, understanding that one of them was a preacher, required a sermon before they went in for trial. Beals thought it right to hold a meeting with the soldiers, which proved to be a highly favored season. A young man then in the fort was converted, and, some time after, moved among Friends, became a member and, at a very advanced age, bore public testimony to the truth of the principles of which he was convinced at the fort. After this meeting was over the Friends were permitted to go on their journey. They crossed the Ohio River, into what is now the state of Ohio, held many meetings with the Indians with satisfaction and returned home with much peace of mind. Thomas Beals told his friends that he saw with his spiritual eye the seed of Friends scattered all

over that good land, that one day there would be the greatest gathering of Friends there of any place in the world and that his faith was strong in the belief that he would live to see Friends settle north of the Ohio River.

In 1799, twenty-four years after his first visit, he moved, with other members of his family, to Ohio. On August 29, 1801, he died and was buried near Richmondale, Ross County, Ohio, in a coffin of regular shape, hollowed out of a solid white walnut tree. His grave was recently located and local Friends have erected an appropriate monument to his memory. In the planting of Quakerism in the Old Northwest, the story of Thomas Beals and his faithful wife and devoted family is but one illustration of the hundreds that might be given; but to him belongs the credit of having been the first Friend to carry the message of Christ into a vast region north and west of the Ohio River.

The first established Meeting of Friends west of the Alleghany Mountains was at Westland in southwestern Pennsylvania. This was provided for by the action of Hopewell Monthly Meeting, Virginia, November 11, 1782. Groups of Friends from Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia, were augmented by a large movement from the Carolinas and Georgia. Probably the greatest factor in this movement was the slavery issue. After the passage of the famous Ordinance of 1787 Friends knew that the territory north and west of the Ohio would be forever free from slavery. There were doubtless other contributing reasons.

In the year 1796, George Harlan and family, members of the Society of Friends, moved to the Ohio region. So far as is known this was the first Quaker family to locate in the Northwest Territory. In February, 1797, Jesse Baldwin and Phineas Hunt crossed the Ohio River. On

May 8th of the same year a group of Friends moved from Westland, Pennsylvania, and settled on the east side of the Scioto River below Chillicothe. John Warner, son of Isaac and Mary Warner, was born in Ross County, Ohio, on July 12, 1798. So far as we know, he was the first child born as a birthright member of the Society of Friends northwest of the Ohio River. On November 11th of the same year, Rebecca Chandler, daughter of William and Hannah Chandler, was born near the same place.

In 1798, a group of Friends from Hopewell, Virginia, and another group from North Carolina, settled in Ross County. In 1799, Obediah Overman and his family from Grayson County, Virginia, arrived with Thomas Beals and his family already mentioned. On their arrival, they opened a meeting for worship in the dwelling of Jesse Baldwin. The nearest Meeting to them was Westland, Pennsylvania, about two hundred miles away.

The intensified movement began about 1800, when settlements were being made west of the Ohio River, some miles out from Wheeling, Virginia. About the same time Friends from the South were migrating into southern and southwestern Ohio, and soon the Eastern and New England States were making their contributions. They constituted a "meeting-going" population. These people, who, in the long march through the wilderness had rested on the First Day of the week and, at the accustomed hour, had gathered around their campfires for silent worship, or listened to vocal ministry from some of their own number, were not likely to neglect their religious duties when their travels were ended. There is a tradition, which is probably true, that at Concord (Colerain) a group assembled first on the trunk of a fallen tree, then were invited to the newly erected cabin of Jonathan Taylor, and later moved to a log meeting house.

The first Friends moved into eastern Ohio in September, 1800. In less than one year Friends so increased that two Preparative Meetings were established, and, on December 19, 1801, Concord Monthly Meeting was opened. The stream of emigrants seemed unending and soon there were Friends communities in Belmont, Jefferson, Harrison, Columbiana, Morgan and Washington counties. Early in 1804 these meetings began to look to the establishment of a Quarterly Meeting. Their request was granted by the Yearly Meeting in 1806 and Short Creek Quarterly Meeting convened for the first time, June 6, 1807.

We now go to another part of the state. In the latter part of 1799 some families of Friends from Bush River Monthly Meeting, South Carolina, settled near the present site of Waynesville. Some months later a group of Friends arrived from Hopewell Monthly Meeting, Virginia, and, during the same year, a few came from North Carolina. Other Friends continued to arrive and a volunteer meeting for worship was established, April 26, 1801, at Waynesville. Twelve families were represented in the meeting. All of these members were certified to Westland Monthly Meeting, western Pennsylvania. This Meeting was recognized by Westland Monthly Meeting, December 26, 1801, and Miami Monthly Meeting was established October 13, 1803. From this nucleus developed the Meetings of Ohio west of the Hocking River, including what later became West Branch Quarterly Meeting to the north, and Whitewater Quarterly Meeting in eastern Indiana, as well as all the Friends meetings in Indiana and farther west.

The rapid settlement of Friends in the valleys of the Miamis is shown by the fact that, in the three years from the middle of 1804 to the middle of 1807, there were

received at Miami Monthly Meeting 367 removal certificates conveying to that Meeting the membership of 1,697 persons. These did not all settle in the vicinity of Waynesville nor even in Warren County, but were scattered through what are now Clinton, Highland, Greene, Montgomery, Miami and Preble counties in Ohio and Wayne County, Indiana.

In February, 1806, four young men led by David Hoover, who were natives of North Carolina, but who had been residing for a short time in Ohio, searching for a home, came to the country upon the Whitewater River, a short distance above where Richmond, Indiana, now stands. It was then in its primeval untrodden state, covered with a dense forest of valuable timber. These persons carried back with them glowing accounts of the new country, by which several Friends were induced to emigrate to it in August, 1806. In the fall of 1806, John Simpson, a minister from Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, paid a religious visit to the few Friends in the settlement and held a meeting in the cabin occupied by Jeremiah Cox. He was, no doubt, the first ministering Friend who visited Indiana, and appears to have left a very favorable impression upon the little congregation. After leaving Whitewater he went to visit a company of Shawnee Indians, under the celebrated chief Tecumseh, who were then encamped near Greenville, in Darke County, Ohio, about twenty-five miles to the northeast.

It is believed that Friends first commenced holding religious meetings regularly, in this infant settlement, in the summer of 1807.

Into the southern part of Indiana John Hollowell of North Carolina came in 1806 and brought his family in 1807. Zacharias Lindley settled at the head of Lick Creek in 1808. Jonathan Lindley, who became a prominent

man in the early history of the state, came to southern Indiana in 1811. A meeting was organized in his new cabin home which was regularly established August 29, 1812, and a Monthly Meeting was established September 25, 1813. This was the first Friends Meeting in the Southern part of Indiana. Blue River Meeting was established the following year and from these two Friends communities central and western Indiana Quakerism largely developed. The first Friends settlement in Western Indiana was in Vigo County, a few miles south of the present site of Terre Haute. Friends reached the central part of the state in what is now Morgan County in November, 1820, and a regular organized meeting was recognized in 1823. Friends gradually moved northward into Hendricks, Marion, Hamilton, Boone, Howard, and other counties, and westward into Parke, Vermillion, and Montgomery counties. By 1828, thirty-seven monthly meetings were regularly established in Indiana Yearly Meeting, and in many instances there were a number of local meetings associated together in a monthly meeting. At the same time there were fifty-two individual meetings within the limits of Ohio Yearly Meeting.

A number of these Friends communities in the Old Northwest made important contributions to the Nation. Chief among these in the earlier period were Mount Pleasant, Salem, Damascus, Waynesville, and New Vienna in Ohio, and Richmond, Fountain City, Salem, Bloomingdale, and Spiceland in Indiana. Mount Pleasant was founded about the year 1800. Within a few years the thriving town became one of the leading business and industrial centers of eastern Ohio and commanded trade over territory of more than a hundred square miles. There soon developed a flouring mill, a woolen factory, a tannery, and one of the first and largest pork-packing establish-

ments of the state. The most extensive meat market and one of the largest woolen markets of the state were here. John W. Gill built here in 1840 the first factory in the United States for the weaving of silk. In 1841 the United States Government, through Henry Clay, ordered from this factory a large silk national flag. It was taken to China by Caleb Cushing, the first United States minister to that government, and was the first American flag ever floated from an American embassy in that far-off land. In the election of 1844 the employees of the silk factory voted for Clay using silk ballots made in the factory.

The chief glory of Mount Pleasant was not in its material development, but in the higher realm of mental and spiritual things. There were a number of college men among the early settlers and great interest was shown in the development of schools. In 1837 there was erected here the Friends Boarding School. This school did valuable service. The main building was destroyed by fire in 1875 and the school was rebuilt near Barnesville. It has made a creditable contribution to education for over a hundred years.

For many years, Mount Pleasant was considered the literary center of eastern Ohio. A number of periodicals, magazines and books were published here. *The Philanthropist* published by Charles Osborn, issued August 29, 1817, was the first American newspaper to advocate the abolition of slavery. The Ohio "Agents" were all men of prominence in their communities and two are worthy of special note; Benjamin Lundy, the pioneer leader in the anti-slavery movement in the United States, and Benjamin Hanna, the grandfather of Senator Marcus A. Hanna. Abigail Flanner was an unusual woman for her day, and Mary Edmundson, the mother of Anna Dickinson, taught school in the Short Creek Meeting House.

Salem, Ohio, became an outstanding center of Quaker influence during the slavery controversy and New Vienna was at one time a center for Friends' publications. Richmond, Indiana, became the center for Indiana Yearly Meeting and with Earlham and Greenmont colleges it became an educational center.

Fountain City was perhaps the most outstanding anti-slavery community in the state. The home of Levi Coffin at Fountain City has been called the Union Station of the Under Ground Railroad although the town was a recognized depot before his arrival there in 1826. Several lines from the Ohio River north through Ohio and Indiana converged at this point and Levi Coffin had the distinction of having assisted 3300 escaped slaves to freedom. More than 2000 of these passed under his care during the years he lived at Fountain City. It was an important focus in the work of the Free Produce Association in the distribution of Free Labor goods as Mount Pleasant was the headquarters for this activity in Ohio. From the little village so replete with anti-slavery sentiment, three anti-slavery papers were published at one time: (a) *The Protectionist*, begun in 1841, championing the cause of political reform, ably edited by Arnold Buffum; (b) *The Free Labor Advocate*, edited by Henry H. Way and Benjamin Stanton; (c) *The Jubilee*, published by the Anti-Slavery Tract Society, intending to be a message of glad tidings, exhibiting the progress of the cause. All were out-and-out abolition papers.

In this village there were also a large number of societies. In one of Buffum's papers is the announcement of ten meetings. There was the General Anti-Slavery Society, The Woman's Society, The Debating Society for political discussion, Free Labor Meetings, etc. The meetings when assembled often lasted two or three days. These

words are to be found in one of the announcements: "There will be a great Anti-Slavery Meeting at this place," giving time, etc. "Friends of the cause, come one and all. Come early in the morning, prepared to stay all night." At one time, New Garden was the banner township in the United States for the Liberty ticket, giving a larger majority of votes than any other township in the country.

At Salem, Indiana, was organized the Salem Peace Society in 1819 with fifty-seven members, thirty-nine of whom were Quakers. A descendant of one of these Quakers was for many years General Secretary of the American Peace Society and editor of the *Advocate of Peace* and made many trips abroad in the interest of peace and international arbitration.

Barnabas C. Hobbs, also a descendant of one of these Quakers, under the leading of the Spirit, made a visit to St. Petersburg in 1878 to lay before Czar Alexander II a memorial praying for exemption from military duties of all Russian subjects who had conscientious scruples against war, and urging upon the Czar the adoption of arbitration as a substitute for war.

Bloomington and Spiceland early became educational centers and, under the influence of Hobbs and Clarkson Davis, exerted a great influence upon Indiana and the nation. Joseph Gurney Cannon and Dr. Charles A. Beard were graduates of the Quaker schools in these places.

FRIENDS AND THE INDIANS

Because of a misunderstanding existing between the United States and several of the Indian tribes about the year 1791, Friends addressed a memorial to Congress, the object of which was to show the expediency of pursuing pacific measures toward settling disputes with the Indians.

Early in 1793 deputations from several Indian tribes visited Philadelphia, then the capital of the new United States of America, with a view of reconciling their differences, and the government agreed that a treaty conference should be held in the Indian country, near Detroit, during the following year. The Indian deputies repeatedly urged that some Friends should be present stating that "the nations represented had a special confidence in Friends." The proposal was accepted and six Friends were appointed to accompany the commission appointed by the Government after having obtained the President's approbation. One of these was Jacob Lindley who kept a journal of his trip in this service. A perusal of this interesting document shows the interest taken by Friends for the Indians and its effect upon them.

Two Friends visited some of the Indians on the Muskingum River in 1793. Timothy Pickering, Secretary of State, expressed appreciation and hearty co-operation with the Friends in this field.

Although Friends did not send a deputation to Ft. Greenville, Ohio, in 1795, when the famous Indian treaty was made between the various Indian tribes of the region and the United States government represented by General Anthony Wayne, yet a suitable address was prepared and sent to the conference.

Concern felt by Friends for the welfare of the Indians in the Old Northwest was evidenced in their visits, activities and support of a definite program for their betterment. Centers were established and supported at Detroit, Michigan, Sandusky, Upper Sandusky, and Wapaughkonnetta, Ohio, as well as services rendered in Indiana, particularly at Ft. Wayne in the earlier years, and at White's Institute later. When Friends began to settle in Ohio and Indiana they at once assumed a definite responsibility

concerning the welfare of the Indian which has been continued without interruption to the present day. From the establishment of Ohio Yearly Meeting in 1813 on through the years we find recorded in the annual minutes reports of work done for and among the Indians.

When Indiana Yearly Meeting was established in 1821, attention was directed at once to the Indians in that section of the country who were suffering from the advances and greed of the white man, and a Committee of men and women was appointed to co-operate with Friends of Baltimore and Ohio Yearly Meetings to investigate.

After careful consideration the Committee decided that Wapaughkonnetta, a reservation in northwest Ohio, was a place well adapted for their work. The Indians had been sought by missionaries of other organizations, but they rejected their offers, stating that they had taken the Quakers by the hand and would hold them fast because they had always given them good advice and had told them things which made them glad. They even went so far as to differentiate between "Quakers and white people." The work as a whole at this reservation was very successful. In 1832 the Government decided to join the Shawnees at Wapaughkonnetta with the remainder of their tribe west of the Mississippi River, but the labors of the Quakers were not lost. Not only had the tribe obtained sufficient knowledge of agriculture to supply their more pressing wants, but they had also acquired habits of industry which they never lost.

As soon as the Indians arrived in their Kansas home it was thought best to send a deputation to visit them. The War Department had charge of the reserve, so it was necessary to obtain the Secretary's permission to carry out the purposes of the visit. The Secretary approved of their plans and stated that he had full confidence in the philan-

thropic intentions and practical good sense of the Friends and was glad that they were not to abandon those whom they had so long assisted in Ohio.

The policy of the Government toward the Indians preceding and during the Civil War had aroused the attention of the Friends, and they appealed to President Ulysses S. Grant to adopt some more peaceful and Christian course toward them. Grant then turned to the Quaker delegation and asked for practical aid in the nomination of Indian agents and employees. This necessitated a closer organization and, in 1869, an "Associated Executive Committee of Friends on Indian Affairs" was formed, in which Friends located in the Old Northwest assumed a prominent place.

This system worked excellently for about ten years, but, because of political interference, the Committee called upon President Rutherford B. Hayes, May 20, 1879, and respectfully informed him that the Society could no longer be responsible for agencies under the official control of the Commissioner and that they now resigned the charge.

"White's Manual Labor Institute," near Wabash, Indiana, was founded in 1853 by a legacy of Joseph White of Philadelphia. White's object, as stated in his will, was "to provide for poor children, white, colored and Indians, as many as the annual product of the lands I propose to buy will support and such as have not the means to procure schooling, boarding and clothing themselves." This institution was entrusted to Indiana Yearly Meeting.

In 1882 the Government made arrangement for one hundred Indian children to be placed in different States under suitable care with \$167 per year for the support of each child. Twenty were apportioned to Indiana and the Indian Commission placed them under the care of

White's Institute. The trustees were heartily in favor of this plan. The Indians easily adapted themselves to the methods and habits of the Institute and a general spirit of contentment pervaded the atmosphere. They yielded to authority and influence in religious matters with readiness. As their powers of perseverance and labor were strong, much time was spent in teaching them the industrial arts and they took great delight and interest in the values of labor, time, and money. The work of the Institute as an Indian school was closed in 1895. There was a growing sentiment that the Government should not aid denominational schools in the education of the Indians, and that the Board could no longer maintain a high standard with the funds appropriated.

In 1880, the attention of the Indian Committee was called to the condition of a remnant of the Cherokee Indians who were still living in North Carolina. It was found that the tribe numbered about seventeen hundred and that they held about seventy thousand acres of rough mountain land. They also possessed \$40,000 in the United States Treasury, invested for educational purposes, but for some cause they had received but little benefit from it. Everyone felt that aid should be extended in this direction, so after due consideration a contract with the Government, the Indian council, and North Carolina and Western Indiana Yearly Meetings was executed. Educational work according to this contract was successfully carried on for ten years. In 1891 negotiations were made by which the control and management of the schools was tendered to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

FRIENDS AND SLAVERY

Slavery and Quakerism could not agree, and it is not strange that, when the Northwest Territory was opened

on the condition that "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude" should exist "except as a punishment for crime," the Quakers set their faces toward the new territory. Many of them sold their land for less than its real value. On horseback, in wagons, over mountains, wading rivers, they came by hundreds and settled in Ohio, Indiana, and other states. What Quaker home in Ohio and Indiana has not its legends concerning these migrations? The words of Mrs. Sarah Parker Albertson who emigrated to Indiana in 1812 are typical: ²

. . . but in a few years i found tha was something else to disturb my peace of mind that i must leave my native land on the account of slavery but thought my helth two pore but finding nothing else would give peace to my tired mind my husband being willing also, we named it to our friends and relations which was not willing and my husband gave over the project and was taken sick with the tifoid fever and brought near unto death but when recovered I named it to him again and disiard him to make the attempt and if i did not live to get thare to take my children thare and I would be content which he agred to do but our relations mostly not being members we met with much discouragement from them and friends also but after working through all in my feeble state and croste the ohio river i could not compare felings to nothing else but like one set free from bondage.

The exodus of Friends from the South, on account of slavery, presents one of the most pathetic scenes in American history. The number of those that migrated amounted to thousands. Almost all left Georgia and South Carolina. Great numbers left North Carolina, and Virginia was so weakened that Virginia Yearly Meeting was laid down, after it had existed for almost a century and a half.

While the South lost some of its best citizens by the removal, those that came north to Ohio and Indiana had

² Original letter in possession of Miss Carrie Hobbs, Plainfield, Indiana.

much to do in making them the strong, liberty loving states they became. In Indiana determined effort was made to introduce slavery into the Territory; and the Friends, by their persistent efforts, working through "Log Conventions," and in every other possible way, furnished much of the agitation that succeeded in defeating the pro-slavery sentiments. Theodore Clark Smith says, "Wherever the Quakers settled, we can trace the anti-slavery agitation."

These settlements in the North, as has already been noted, also became centers for the underground railroad. When this mysterious institution began its work no one can tell, but it is known that before 1800 numbers of slaves escaped from the South, crossing the line into the free states, and Friends aided them on their way to Canada. There were regular stations, with men as careful as any salaried conductors could be. These men risked property and, in many cases, their lives, with no hope of popularity or money. They recognized a law higher than the law of state, and would be true to principle at any cost.

That Friends have the honor of giving to the cause the first anti-slavery papers has never been questioned. Charles Osborn's paper *The Philanthropist* has already been mentioned. Elihu Embree edited a paper in Tennessee, being the first devoted exclusively to the cause. Benjamin Lundy's paper, published at Mount Pleasant in 1821, was the first to make the question a great political issue.

Lundy was the first man in America to devote all his life to the anti-slavery cause. Horace Greeley calls him the "Father of Abolitionism." He was born in New Jersey in 1789. When nineteen years of age, he went to Wheeling, Virginia, to learn the saddler's trade. Here he

saw slaves on their way South, going two by two with a chain passed between them, to which handcuffs were attached. Such scenes fired his soul and with deepened convictions on the subject, he pledged his life unreservedly to the cause. "My heart was deeply grieved," he said, "I heard the wail of the captive. I felt his pang of distress. The iron entered my soul."

He settled at St. Clairsville, Ohio. In 1816, he called in his neighbors and organized a Union Humane Society with six members. This was the first anti-slavery organization in Ohio. He went here and there organizing, and by persistent effort soon had five hundred members. He wrote an appeal to the philanthropists of the United States; and formed a plan for anti-slavery societies, much like those organized later.

At the time of the great excitement on the Missouri question, he went down the Ohio River on a flatboat making his influence felt on the slavery question by enlisting in the discussion in the Illinois and Missouri papers. When he returned home he learned that Charles Osborn had sold his paper during his absence, so he started a paper of his own at Mount Pleasant, which he called the *Genius of Universal Emancipation*, and which, as we have said, was the first paper ever published that made the question a great political issue. After the death of Elihu Embree, he removed his paper to Tennessee, afterwards to Baltimore, and later to Philadelphia.

He traveled through the country, lecturing against slavery and talking to individuals on the subject. In his travels, he called upon most of the leading men of his time, trying to interest them in the all-absorbing subject. John Quincy Adams was his devoted personal friend. He enlisted a great number of men and women in the cause. Among them were many of the younger genera-

tion, who became leaders after Lundy's work was finished, William Lloyd Garrison being the outstanding example. Garrison says of Lundy, "To him, I owe my connection with the cause of emancipation, as he was the first to call my attention to it; and, by his pressing invitation to join him in printing and editing the *Genius of Universal Emancipation* at Baltimore in 1828, he shaped my destiny for the remainder of my life."

After the death of Elijah P. Lovejoy, Lundy went to Illinois to edit his paper. For eighteen years Lundy's bugle call was heard. It remained for him to lay the foundation for the Republican Party in Illinois and prepare the way for Abraham Lincoln. He died at Lowell, Illinois, in 1839.

On November 9 and 10, 1840, an anti-slavery meeting was held in the Friends' meeting-house in Economy, Indiana. Charles Osborn was president. A committee of three, consisting of Arnold Buffman, Daniel Worth, and Nathan Johnson, the latter the grandfather of ex-Congressman Henry U. Johnson, was appointed to propose business for the convention. The committee reported the following resolutions:

That we recommend to the abolitionists throughout the United States to call a national convention of the friends of independent nominations as early as practicable, to nominate candidates for President and Vice-President for the election of 1844.

That we recommend to abolitionists in this state to make independent nominations for executive, legislative and judicial offices, and to withhold their suffrages from all candidates who do not make a public avowal of their intentions to advocate a system of protection for the liberties and rights of all men.

That five delegates be now appointed to attend a state convention to promote independent political action, to be

convened at the time and place of holding the next annual meeting of the state anti-slavery society; and the several district conventions are hereby invited to choose a like number of delegates to said convention.

The state convention called for in the resolutions was held at Newport, now Fountain City, in Wayne County, on February 8, 1841. The question of forming an abolition party was discussed throughout two sessions and finally resulted in a call for a national convention to nominate candidates for President and Vice-President, "who will not basely renounce the fundamental principles of righteous government to secure slave holding popularity."

Obedient to the call of this convention a state political party was formed in opposition to slavery. At different times the new party met in conventions and went before the people for their suffrages. Finally, in 1860, under the name Republican, the party was elected to power and Abraham Lincoln was placed in the presidential chair to enforce the principles struggled for by the early settlers in Wayne County.

The Quaker agitation against slavery continued until the emancipation proclamation was issued. Wherever there were Friends' communities, or sometimes even an individual Friend, there the agitation was carried on, and it was a leaven that finally leavened the whole lump.

FRIENDS AND EDUCATION

As Friends settled in Ohio and Indiana they at once turned their attention to the establishment of schools and the history of this contribution in the Old Northwest would constitute a volume in itself. In both eastern and southwestern Ohio schools of elementary, secondary, and collegiate grade were established and in the earlier years

Columbiana County was fairly dotted with Friends schools.

In the early history of the state of Indiana, illiteracy was alarming but the Friends had schools organized while Indiana was still a Territory and they later developed a system of schools which set a standard for the system of public education established later. As a result of close supervision and the home training of Friends' children, the moral standard of these schools was very high and they were largely freed from the roughness and rowdyism which brought many a schoolmaster in the early half of the nineteenth century to grief and failure. By 1850 the Friends had worked out a regular system of education for their children. Practically every community had its subscription school which was under the supervision of the local meeting. The same plan was pursued in Ohio, Illinois, and even in Michigan and Wisconsin.

Owing to local conditions, it was not advisable for each school to offer more than elementary work but there were in every community a few pupils who wished to take more advanced subjects. As a result, certain schools were established which offered both elementary and advanced courses. These schools corresponded to, and later became, modern high schools.

As shown by the Yearly Meeting reports on the subject of education there were, in 1840, in the limits of Indiana Yearly Meeting seven thousand six hundred and fifty-one children of school age and of this number only three hundred and nineteen, or about one in twenty-four, were not in school. In the same year, according to Richard Gause Boone's *History of Education in Indiana*, one-seventh of the population was illiterate. The school legislation in Indiana for thirty years had accomplished very little, and the condition of education was arousing much

public sentiment. As a result a system of free schools was adopted by the state after a hard fight in 1848, but difficulties were encountered and very little was accomplished, especially along the lines of advanced education. The first attempt to establish a public high school in Indiana was in Evansville in 1850, while the Friends, by 1850, had twelve well-organized schools doing advanced work which would compare favorably with our modern high schools. By 1867, eighteen high schools had been opened, although some of these had been discontinued because of lack of funds, while by the same year the Friends had established twenty schools with advanced courses. By 1832 they were considering definite plans for a denominational boarding school, which was opened in 1847, and later became Earlham College.

Friends anticipated the present movement toward manual training and practical studies. This idea was introduced in the founding of the Friends Academy at Bloomington, Indiana, in 1845. They also anticipated the present movement toward a longer term of school, the present tendency to insist on sanitary conditions and the physical health of students, and were pioneers in co-education.

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

In affairs of government the Friends of the Old Northwest have found a place. When Lincoln needed a Secretary of War he chose the stern, methodical, forceful Edwin M. Stanton whose grandmother, as a widow with a large family, drove her wagon with the first group of Quakers who entered eastern Ohio in 1800. Joseph Gurney Cannon spent his earlier years in a Quaker community in western Indiana where his father was recognized as one of the most influential Friends, and later moved on

to Illinois where he spent the later years of his life. He said that it was the Quaker vote in his district that first sent him to Congress.

Herbert Hoover, the only Quaker President of the United States, while never a citizen of the Old Northwest, was a descendant of a Quaker family who first established themselves, after their removal from the South, in western Ohio. George W. Julian, candidate for the vice-presidency in 1852 was of Quaker descent.

A number of the prominent men of affairs in the political life of Ohio and Indiana have been either Friends or descendants of Friends.

The final defeat of Henry Clay for the presidency has been ascribed by some to the memorable speech which he made at Richmond, Indiana, in 1842, at which time Quakers in the audience addressed certain questions to him which forced him to take a position which was unsatisfactory to both north and south.

The visit of Isaac and Sarah Harvey to express their "concern" to Lincoln in 1862 offers an illustration of the Divine Guidance of Friends who represented the spirit of the olden times. What influence this may have had on the President of the United States we shall never know, but it is interesting that just three days later the preliminary draft of the Emancipation Proclamation was announced.

Friends were pioneers in the temperance movement and always have been active in promoting the cause of total abstinence from narcotics and intoxicants. These efforts have been promoted by official committees on temperance and prohibition and it is significant that all of the temperance legislation in Indiana previous to the passage of the eighteenth amendment was championed by Friends and the four principal laws carried the names of Indiana

Friends, who were in the state legislature. In the campaign in Kansas, David Tatum was one of the leaders, and in 1880 Elias Jessup polled enough votes for governor of Iowa to force prohibition to the front so that in 1882 the prohibition amendment was carried. Both of these men were from the Old Northwest. Quaker women rallied to the support of the crusade and have been active in the work of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. For many years the presidents of the state Woman's Christian Temperance Unions in Ohio and Indiana have been Friends.

Friends also took the lead in Indiana in legislation in the interests of prison reform. They were responsible largely for the establishment of the Boys Reform School in 1869, of the Woman's Prison in 1873, the Girls Reformatory in 1904, and of the Indiana Board of State Charities in 1889, and various members have occupied responsible positions in their administrations.

Elizabeth Comstock, of Michigan, a Friends minister, visited more jails, reformatories and penitentiaries in various parts of the United States than any other person in her time and has been referred to as the "Elizabeth Fry of America."

IN INDUSTRY

Another distinct contribution of the Friends toward the development of the Old Northwest was in the field of horticulture and stock raising. In the early settlement of the Miami Valley, Silas Wharton of New Jersey started a nursery near Waynesville, Ohio. A little later Andrew Hampton began a nursery about six miles north of Richmond. The materials for these nurseries were brought in largely from New Jersey which at that time ranked as high in horticulture as any state in the Union. Soon after,

Cornelius Ratliff established a nursery near Richmond. Emery Albertson and C. M. Hobbs, originally from Washington County, established a nursery at Bridgeport, Indiana, which has become one of the leading nurseries in the country. Up to 1865 the leading nurserymen in Indiana were members of the Society of Friends.

As early as 1830, many Friends were engaged in stock raising. A profitable business in livestock was early developed in eastern Ohio, and Mount Pleasant became an important center for this industry. Friends took a leading part in introducing into Ohio improved cattle, sheep and hogs, which attracted much attention because of their superior quality. When speaking of something above the average, it is said the expression, "as good as Quaker cattle," was often used.

It has been impossible to give a complete survey of the contribution of Friends to the making of the Old Northwest. Thomas Beals' vision of 1775 has been realized to the extent that more than one-third of the Friends in America have resided in this region.

Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, Bart: [1786–1845.]

A Footnote to *Elizabeth Fry: Quaker Heroine*

Janet Whitney

XIII

SIR THOMAS FOWELL BUXTON, BART:

[1786-1845]

A FOOTNOTE TO *ELIZABETH FRY*:
QUAKER HEROINE

Fowell Buxton was born of parents who admired the faculty of courage beyond all other virtues. Fortunately for himself he was a vigorous and determined child, and perhaps for this reason as well as the Spartan ambition of his parents, was put into boarding-school at the age of four and a half. He was bullied, beaten and underfed there for more than a year. Then the state of his health opened his parents' eyes to the situation, and he was promptly removed, though merely to another and better school.¹ But the early experience did not break little Fowell's spirit. It rather hardened his will. Unlike Cowper, who never dared to lift his eyes above the boots of his tormenter, and to the end of his life could not imagine the bully's face, but was haunted in his dreams by a horrible pair of threatening, pursuing feet, Fowell Buxton carried away less fear than anger. No secret dread sapped his self-confidence, but a hatred of tyranny and slavery was lighted in his heart.

When Fowell Buxton was six years old, his father died, and from then on his education was directed by his mother, but was not the more feminine on that account. Vigor was the chief characteristic of Mrs. Buxton, and her five children regarded her with a respect that was only moderately tempered by affection. Fowell, however, benefited

¹ The first school was at Kingston; the second at Greenwich, under Dr Charles Burney.

by her extremely orthodox Anglican views. She believed profoundly in the rights of primogeniture and in male supremacy. And she taught her eldest son that on his father's death he was by undisputed inheritance the head of the house. The four younger children were told to obey him, and Fowell domineered over them heartily. He himself wrote in maturity, when married and with children of his own, "I became at ten years old almost as much the master of the family as I am of this family at the present moment."

His mother treated him as an equal (except at such times as he seemed likely to cross her will. Then she would stand no nonsense!) and discussed matters of business and education and politics with him as if he had been an adult.

Fowell Buxton confessed that there were perhaps drawbacks to such a system, but he could not fail to be aware of its obvious advantages, at least to himself, the chief of which was the formation of the habit of decision. "Throughout life I have acted and thought for myself."

The other great influence on his youth was his mother's game-keeper, Abraham Plaistow, whose fearlessness was proverbial, a daring rider, a good shot, a man learned in the natural lore of the outdoors, without book-learning but with commonsense and integrity. Buxton never forgot what he owed to this man, and the retrospect of maturity only confirmed and deepened his debt. When an opportunity came, years later, to introduce his old servant and teacher to the Earlham family, he wrote in his unconsciously peremptory fashion to his young wife—"I shall reach Earlham on Tuesday; Sam Hoare and Abraham Plaistow will be with me, and I hope the latter will be treated with deserved distinction, as he was for the first twelve years of my life the dearest friend I had."

Buxton's days at boarding-school ended before he was fifteen. He decided, as his own guardian, that it was time he left, and he persuaded his mother to the same opinion. Nobody, at any rate, could claim that he was learning very much at school. And his great height and strength, and overbearing ways made him a difficult boy to deal with anywhere. There was some theory that he would study at home, and he came home, to spend most of his time at outdoor sports, or at best riding about the lanes with a novel in his hand. As he says of himself, he was of a "daring, violent, domineering temper," and he had almost attained his final height of six foot four. His irritated mother tried to correct at least his manners by satire. No weapon is so wounding or so ill-suited to sensitive adolescence. Fowell was discouraged, miserable and angry. It was a critical moment. Then his friend John Gurney junior invited him to Earlham. He went, in the golden autumn weather of 1801. And the color of his life was changed.

What were the influences that so wrought upon him? First, the happy democracy of a family group where all expressed themselves freely, and where no one even held a theory that the eldest son should dominate the rest. Second, the group was largely feminine, and the grace and charm of girlhood in its bloom surrounded him on every hand. Third, an atmosphere of activity and energy pervaded the house. No one was idle. Everyone was busy. Italian and French and music and drawing, literature classic and modern, even Latin and Greek, were the chosen pursuits of these energetic young people, each one to his taste. Fowell Buxton's own dormant intellect awoke, his energy found new outlet, he answered the cordial expectations of his new friends by plunging eagerly to work like the rest. He could write to his mother "Mr. Gurney is

so good-tempered, his daughters are so agreeable, and John so thoroughly delightful. . . . I have learned so much, and have got thoroughly acquainted with the most agreeable family in the world. . . . You need not fear that I am losing my time. Being with the Gurneys makes me ten times more industrious than anything else would."

But above all these influences was another and greater that entered his heart softly when his nature had been opened by the rest. He fell in love. It was with a boy's ardor but with a man's tenacity. Hannah Gurney, youngest but two of the seven daughters, returned to Earlham in the middle of his visit, driving up in the great carriage with her married sister Elizabeth Fry, her brother-in-law Joseph Fry, and their first baby. It was as she stood in the drive under the golden lindens with tiny baby Katherine in her arms that Buxton's violent nature was stirred with a poignant tenderness, and he said to himself, "She shall be my wife!"²

He went shortly after to Dublin University, determined to excel, to make himself worthy of the good opinion of his new friends. And his will, now harnessed in a good service, was equal to the strain. Writing of it later he says:

I became speedily a youth of steady habits of application and irresistible resolution. I soon gained the ground I had lost, and I found those things which were difficult and almost impossible to my idleness, easy enough to my industry; and much of my happiness and all of my prosperity in life have resulted from the change I made.

He took high marks, won gold and silver medals, visited Earlham in the vacations, and wrote ardently to Hannah month by month:

² Janet Whitney, *Elizabeth Fry, Quaker Heroine*, p. 125.

My utmost examinationary hopes are realised . . . and what is better, I can ascribe my success to *nothing but my Earlham visit* . . . I am sure that if I had not thought that I was partly working for you, I never should have been able to read so much during this month. . . . You must remember that one slight word of approbation from Earlham would be more grateful to me than the loudest applause of the whole world besides.

Dublin University had been chosen rather than Oxford or Cambridge because he expected to inherit considerable estates in Ireland. This hope was destroyed in an expensive lawsuit before the close of his brilliant university career, but he had then too strong a feeling that the world was his oyster for such a loss to depress him in the least. Honors, achievement, friendship, popularity, and a prospering love-affair, all were his, along with youth, a striking physique, and a self-confidence that all his diffidence before Hannah could not quell. He could well afford to lose the assurance of immediate wealth. He wrote at this time to a friend in trouble that he wished he could share with him some of his happiness. "I think I might very well spare happiness enough for a moderate person, and still have enough left for myself."

Immediately on graduating from the University he married Hannah Gurney at Norwich, prospects or none, and settled down for an anxious period of searching for employment, or rather of searching for the opening of an ambitious career. He was in due course offered a promising start in the firm of Truman and Hanbury, brewers, in which his mother's brother was a controlling partner. Buxton put the same energy and determination into business that he had put into college work, and into the wooing of his shy bride. In five years' time he was made a

partner in the firm, and from then onward found it absolutely impossible to avoid the deceitfulness of riches.

Yet he used those riches to go into Parliament and to work there for the saving of Hindu widows from suttee and for the freeing of the slaves; and he supported many public and private charities. He believed that riches and possessions were hampering to the spirit, he thought a better life could be lived without them, but he had them, and he used them. Perhaps the death of four children in one month, and later the lingering death from consumption of a boy of seventeen, kept him reminded of the things that money cannot buy.

II

Marrying, as he did, a Quaker girl, and being strongly influenced by a Quaker family, Buxton as a young man had serious thoughts of joining Friends. But he was not by nature more religious than other young men. Religion was not to him a matter of supremest moment, as to the young William Penn, for instance. The reasons that lured him toward Quakerism were rather of a concrete practical kind. He would like to found a home like Earlham; and Earlham was a Quaker home. He would like to please his precious Hannah; and Hannah was (it was quite definitely part of her charm) a Quaker.

But the arguments in favor being of that nature, he could balance against them arguments equally practical. If he joined Friends, he would have to leave the Church of England, and he had been educated in the Anglican tradition and it was dear to him. His mother, though connected with the Gurneys, was strongly against his leaving the Church. Finally, and most important, to become a Quaker would be to sacrifice all chance of public

office or of entering Parliament. Ambition decided a case in which conscience was hardly involved. Buxton remained an Anglican. It was indeed gentle Hannah who later left Friends and became a member of her husband's communion.

The thought of a parliamentary career had been put into Buxton's mind by the honor offered him as he left college. Dublin University in those days "owned" a seat in the British House of Commons. This seat was offered to Fowell Buxton, and he only declined it on the grounds of his immediate marriage and the need to get to work at some remunerative career to support his wife.⁸ He never regretted this decision. But the idea of Parliament never left him. And in 1818 he freed himself from business ties sufficiently to stand for election. The constituency suggested to him was Weymouth, and there he was triumphantly returned to Parliament by a considerable majority, after such a generous and fair-minded campaign that his promoters believed that he had given away his chances of success. He stood as an Independent, not wishing to link himself with either party. Joseph John Gurney wrote to him on his election:

Thou wilt of course be considered by everybody as the representative of the prison cause. To that cause thou art pledged. . . . But do not let thy independence of all party be the means of leading thee away from *sound Whiggism*. . . . Let us take especial care to avoid *the spirit of Toryism*. I mean that spirit which bears the worst things with endless apathy *because they are old*.

Buxton answered him by an account of the first debate at which he was present in the House of Commons, an extraordinarily exciting one on the riot in Manchester which was called the massacre of Peterloo. Buxton wrote:

⁸ Members were not then paid. Only a man of private means could afford to sit in Parliament.

Did the debate influence my ambition? Why, in one sense it did. It convinced me that I have the opportunity of being a competitor on the greatest arena that ever existed; but it also taught me that success in such a theatre is only for those who will devote their lives to it. . . . I hold a doctrine to which I owe—not much, indeed, but all the little success I ever had—viz. that with ordinary talents and extraordinary perseverance, all things are attainable.

Fowell Buxton was a member of Parliament, on and off, for twenty years. During that time, there was no progressive measure that did not have the support of his vote and often of his voice. He was an able, weighty and vigorous speaker. He championed the reform of prisons, the reform of the penal code, the reform of the Poor Laws. He obtained the abolition of suttee, and together with Wilberforce, after years of struggle, he won the emancipation of every slave under the British flag. In 1841 he was created a baronet, and when he died in 1845 a monument to him was placed beside that of Wilberforce in Westminster Abbey.

III

Hannah never knew him as violent. His boyish violence was only energy running to waste, and after the turning-point of that visit to Earlham there was no more wastage, it was all joyfully and heartily put to work. But she did know him as daring, and perhaps in her secret heart she sometimes confessed that he was domineering. Dominating, certainly. Most kind, most considerate, most affectionate; but never questioning even that he was to be regarded by himself and others as the absolute and undisputed head of the family and master of the house. The incident of poor Prince, the dog, gives a picture of all Buxton's most vivid qualities. Louisa Hoare might have

been moved by a spirit of prophecy when, as a few-weeks bride giving matronly advice to her young engaged sister, she wrote Hannah that one of her wifely duties would be to beware of mad dogs and to see that her husband always went out in boots "for they generally bite men's legs."⁴ In the summer of 1816 one of Fowell Buxton's own dogs went mad. Buxton was on horseback when he met him, foaming along the road:

♣When I got into Hampstead I saw Prince covered with mud, running furiously and biting at everything. I saw him bite at least a dozen dogs, two boys and a man. . . . I tried every effort to stop him or kill him, or to drive him into some out-house, but in vain. At last he sprang up at a boy, and seized him by the breast; happily I was near him and knocked him off with my whip. He then set off towards London, and I rode by his side, waiting for some opportunity of stopping him. I continually spoke to him, but he paid no regard to coaxing or scolding. . . . I was terrified at the idea of his getting into Camden Town and London, and at length considering that if ever there was an occasion which justified a risk of life, this was it, I determined to catch him myself. Happily he ran up to Pryor's gate, and I threw myself from my horse upon him and caught him by the neck; he bit at me and struggled, but without effect, and I succeeded in securing him without his biting me. He died yesterday, raving mad. P.S. Write me a word whether Fowell⁵ has any wound on his fingers, and if he has one made by the dog, let it be cut out immediately: mind, these are my positive orders.

Although Elizabeth Fry considered herself the most ruled by her husband of all the Fry wives,⁶ it is hard to imagine Joseph Fry using such a tone as that. And in fact he never did. Nor did Fox to Margaret Fell; nor even

⁴ Whitney, *op. cit.*, p. 152

⁵ One of our Fowell Buxton's little sons, the only child at home at the time. The others were away on a visit

⁶ Whitney, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

William Penn, himself a dominant man, to his beloved and inefficient Gulielma. It was not the tone of a Quaker husband. There spoke the Anglican, fruit of the marriage service. But no doubt Quaker-bred Hannah smiled and admired him, and by the sweetness of her manners made him believe that he had a very obedient wife.

In another letter we see him over-ruling his wife's home discipline. She had forbidden one of her sons to go coursing on the opening day of the season as a punishment for some serious misdemeanor, and had written an account of it to her husband. Buxton, himself a sportsman, felt his heart wrung by the severity of the penalty. Dear little Hannah could not know, being a woman, how cruel it would be. Buxton scribbled a note in the House of Commons, delivered it to a servant to ride post haste to North-repps Hall and save the day. But he did it tactfully, so as not to undermine maternal authority:

I write now about the coursing to-morrow. As Charles did not behave well and kindly, you were quite right in deciding to deprive him of the sport to-morrow; but as it is so very great a pleasure to me to think of him as happy and enjoying himself, I hope you will for this time excuse him, and that he will make a point of repaying the indulgence by very good behaviour. Thus we shall think of him as happy and good too.

His relations with his children were of the very happiest. In the intimate association of daily life he was a beloved and generous autocrat, and a considerate companion. Often absent from home for long periods on public affairs, his return was not a cloud and a restraint upon his family, but an occasion of rejoicing, eagerly looked for. He loved to storm the schoolroom and carry off all the youngsters for a day of picnic with horses and dogs. One of his sons wrote while still a boy:

I cannot help being struck with the exquisite tenderness of heart which my father always displays; his unwillingness to debar us from pleasure, the zeal with which he will make any sacrifice or take any trouble to gratify us. His whole appearance, with his worn and thoughtful face, is so much that of a man whom one would approach with some sensation of awe, that these small, though exquisite, acts of tenderness are the more unexpected and consequently the more pleasing.

Buxton himself wrote in a letter:

I know that I am often harsh and violent and very disagreeable, but I sincerely think that I do not know a person less inclined than I am to *curb the deep desires* of others, or to force my views down their throats. I believe I am a true friend to liberty of feeling, and I think it high arrogance in one human being to pretend to dictate to another what is for that other's happiness.

Few fathers would write in such a vein as this to an eldest son at Trinity College, Cambridge:

My mind has much turned towards you of late, and I have thought more than you might suppose of your approaching examination. Not that I am very solicitous about the result, except so far as your heart may be set on success. I should be very sorry to have you damped and disappointed, but for myself I shall be just as well satisfied with you if you are low in the last class as if you are high in the first. But I have a piece of advice to give you. . . .

The rest of the letter is a very tender homily upon the value of prayer.

His advice was not always of this unworldly character. He believed also in the mastery of the things of this world, and often gave his sons precepts, enforced by his own example, on the conquest of time and the training of the will.

You are now a man, and I am persuaded that you must be prepared to hold a very inferior station in life to that which you might fill unless you resolve, with God's help, that whatever you do you will do it *well*; unless you make up your mind that it is better to accomplish perfectly a very small amount of work than to half-do ten times as much. Let the same masculine determination to act to some purpose go through your life. Do the day's work to-day. . . . Again, be punctual. I do not mean the merely being in time for lectures etc. but I mean that spirit out of which punctuality grows, that love of accuracy, precision and vigor which makes the efficient man; the determination that what you have to do *shall be done*, in spite of all petty obstacles, and finished off at once and finally. In Scripture phrase, gird up the loins of your mind. . . .

His homes, Cromer Hall, and later Northrepps Hall, were on the Norfolk coast and tremendous storms sometimes swept up on that bold and exposed shore. One use that Buxton made of his physical strength and daring was to organise rescue parties when there was a wreck off the coast. As sure as there was a storm, he would be down on the sands, giving orders, helping to launch a boat, and on at least one occasion plunging into the raging surf and saving a man by almost superhuman effort at what seemed the certain sacrifice of his own life.

Zest throbbed in his pulses. Once travelling on a snowy winter's night, he kept himself warm in the unheated coach by glowing thoughts. "Children to my heart's content; brothers and sisters the same; friends the same; station in life and circumstances the same; the public objects to which I have been directed, the same; and there are fifty other dittos of the same order."

IV

Buxton was a naturally public-spirited man. His first activities in Parliament were in the cause of prison and

penal-law reform, getting into law many of the theories of his admired sister-in-law Elizabeth Fry. He was also a convinced Free Trader, and in 1830 voted for the Beer Bill, removing Protection from the brewing industry. "I have always voted for free trade when the interests of others were concerned," he remarked, "and it would be awkward to change when my own are in jeopardy. I believe in the principles of free trade, and expect that they will do us good in the long run, though the immediate loss may be large." But his fame lies in another direction.

It is a great source of happiness to be able to set one's heart on attainable and definite aims, and to be absolutely assured that these aims are for the benefit of mankind. Buxton could have claimed before the recording angel that he had saved many more lives than that one man whom with his own arms he had snatched from the sea. All of his chief "public objects" were connected with the saving of life. From the gallows, from sacrificial fires, from starvation, and from the hideous mortality of slavery, a long procession could claim him as their deliverer. It is with the last endeavor that Buxton's name is most often linked.

His interest in the abolition of the slave trade dates from his friendship with Wilberforce. And he met Wilberforce in the House of Commons. Wilberforce at that time was a man of sixty, a veteran fighter for the freedom of the slaves, wealthy, cultivated, a graduate of Cambridge University, and gifted with a singular charm. A man also of that serious and almost anxious religious faith that belonged to the Methodist revival.

Madame de Staël described him as "*l'homme le plus aimé, et le plus considéré de toute l'Angleterre, M. Wilberforce.*"

He was the close and intimate friend of Pitt, and as a young man struggling to put into practice a fresh religious experience, he had written to confide it to that great leader. Some people, astonished at a young man of wealth turning serious, gave out that Wilberforce had become mad with religion. A witty woman, meeting him again after his change of view and feeling the irresistible charm of his new serenity, said, "If this is madness, I hope he will bite us all!"

Fowell Buxton was certainly bitten. In the sixth year of his married life, a severe illness had given him an opportunity of reviewing his religious position and making a decision of faith. As he said of himself, it was not that he doubted, but that, with his active and sceptical temperament, he was afraid that he might doubt. During the long days of convalescence he settled this business once for all, and to the end of his life had a happy and certain feeling of eternal security through faith in Christ. Eternity was very much present to the thoughts of the men and women of his generation. The choice made to-day determined the personal happiness or misery, after the close of this brief life, for ever and ever. As Wilberforce said to a young man who consulted him as to choice of a career, the question is not so much what will satisfy you between your twentieth and thirtieth years as what will satisfy you between your two thousandth and your three thousandth years.

The urgency of this perspective resulted in lives of tireless activity in the service of God and man. And Buxton, like Wilberforce, was able by its means to overcome many personal sorrows, to use all his abilities to the full, and to see many tangible results of his efforts to make the world better.

Wilberforce, after hearing him speak on penal reform,

enlisted him in his small but solid band of humanitarian reformers. Their chief object was the abolition of slavery in all British possessions, and the putting down of the slave trade wherever British influence could reach, i.e. not to allow raiders to practice in British territory nor to bring their bands of captive slaves through any British sphere of influence.

This effort, begun by Wilberforce many years before, was opposed by the planters in the British colonies who used slaves, and by the huge vested interest of the trade, and even by timid conservative opinion in England. A man like Addington, Lord Sidmouth, for instance, would admit the trade ought to be stopped, but would argue that the existing slave numbers must not decrease, and that if natural propagation did not maintain their numbers, enough fresh captives must be regularly brought in to prevent the ruin of planters and their investors at home. Many honest opponents would reason that the slaves could not be very badly treated, from economic reasons if for no other. As valuable saleable property they must receive reasonably humane care, both on their journeys and from their final masters.

Buxton was a great strength to the abolition party. He was an ardent collector of facts. His power as a speaker relied on a succinct and straightforward statement of facts, forcibly delivered. He took pains to gather figures, unanswerable statistics, and authenticated incidents of the appalling slave trade.

"The ships which use this traffic consider they make an excellent voyage if they save one third of the number embarked." "Some vessels are so fortunate as to save one-half of their cargo alive." "Captain Cook says, 'It was stated to me by Captains and Supercargos of other slavers,

that they made a profitable voyage if they lost fifty percent; and that this was not uncommon.' ”

Inadequate food, suffocation in crowded quarters between decks, nostalgia, and plain brutality were the principal causes of this high mortality during what was called the middle passage. Even more appalling stories could be told of the means of capture, the hideous journey to the coast, tied together by the neck, and the methods of sale. Looking back now upon these records, it seems incredible that the system of catching human beings alive like animals in the jungle, cruelly transporting them, with every de-humanising brutality, to another country and climate, and selling them to labor without hope, for other human beings, could ever have been practiced by Christian nations. It shows the curious weakness of the faculty of imagination, the most advanced of human faculties, the one by which alone we can reach backward into the past or forward into the future or outward into the experience of our fellows. Religion itself, divested of imagination, professed to be ranged on the side of the slave-trade by using the argument that the savages in their native jungles were doomed to hell, never having heard of Christ, but when enslaved in a Christian country could hear of the one way of salvation, could 'believe' and be saved, and be thus assured of an eternity of bliss that would, after all, be very cheaply bought at the price of any present misery.

Men like Wilberforce and Buxton did not dispute the major premise, but they were clear that good ends could not be obtained by bad means. The way to save the Africans was to send missionaries to them, not slavers.

Even if actual physical brutality could be ruled out of the slave-trade—as it was in the case of many kind owners, and especially on plantations where slavery had been established for several generations—it was even then in-

human and unchristian, on the following carefully stated legal grounds:

1. The slave in the British colonies, is at all times liable to be sold, or otherwise aliened, at the will of the master, as absolutely, in all respects, as cattle, or any other personal effects.
2. He is also at all times liable to be sold by process of law for satisfaction of the debts of a living, or the debts or bequests of a deceased master, at the suit of creditors or legatees.
3. In consequence of a transfer in either of these ways or by the authority of his immediate owner, the slave may be at any time exiled, in a moment, and for ever, from his home, his family, and the colony in which he was born, or in which he has long been settled.

The cruelty of these practices disposed of those people who supported slavery on the grounds that many slaves, assured of food, clothing and shelter, and not excessive work, were better off than many of the starving poor in the free British Isles.

The progress of any reform, however, which involves large money investments, is always one of slow and patient pressure against the forces of selfishness, inertia, stupidity and mere habit. Constant repetition of facts, in Parliament, in public meetings, in books and pamphlets, and in petitions to the throne, was necessary to work up a rising public opinion, to stimulate dormant imagination and human feeling. Buxton brought the reinforcement of his strong personality, his activity and enthusiasm and money, at just the right time.

Men like Lord John Russell could say in the House of Commons that "although slavery was repugnant to his feelings, he must vote against the abolition as visionary and delusive. It was a feeble attempt without the power to save the cause of humanity. Other nations would take

up the trade." Another could say, "it appeared to him to have been the intention of Providence from the very beginning that one set of men should be slaves to another. This truth was as old as it was universal. It was recognised in every history, under every government, and in every religion. Nor did the Christian religion itself—vide St. Paul—show more repugnance to slavery than any other."

The arguments are so similar to those at present advanced against disarmament and the abolition of war that they make bracing reading. The torch that could no longer be vigorously carried by Wilberforce's failing hand was caught up by Buxton. And the work begun and maintained by the one was finished by the other.

Wilberforce died in 1833. But in the midsummer of 1834 the cause was won. Buxton was sitting in a cool, dim grove of shady trees, within sound of the sea, separated by a noble lawn from his house, Northrepps Hall, when a special messenger came to him with the news that the King had signed the Abolition Bill.

Buxton's journal for Sunday, July 27th, 1834 contains this entry:

On Friday next (August 1st) slavery is to cease throughout the British colonies. I wished therefore to have a season of deep retirement of soul, of earnest prayer and of close communion with my God, and for this purpose I went to a Friends' Meeting.

So warm had the general public become for this measure—a reward for the slow progress of education for it—that the day of freedom was kept throughout England as a day of general rejoicing. And what happened in the colonies? The planters had foretold riot and bloodshed, and many were in a genuine state of terror. Buxton himself was anxious; and when the slow mails at last arrived, bearing

the fateful West Indian stamps, he walked out again into the woods to read them alone under the dark arches of the trees. How had the enslaved and wronged African met his freedom?

On the evening of the 31st of July they had crowded into the chapels and churches. As the hour of midnight approached they fell upon their knees and awaited the great moment all hushed in silent prayer. So passed the last hour of their life as slaves. When the clock struck twelve, the bells everywhere broke into a riotous peal, the Negroes sprang to their feet weeping, shouting and singing. They were free.

Buxton's work for abolition led his mind not only into schemes for the education and welfare of the former slaves in the colonies, but also into the larger question of colonization in general.

My attention has been drawn of late to the wickedness of our proceedings as a nation, towards the ignorant and barbarous natives of countries on which we seize. . . . It appears to me that we ought to fix and enforce certain regulations and laws, with regard to the natives of all countries where we make settlements. Those laws must be based on the principles of justice. In order to do justice we must admit——

1st. That the natives have a right to their own lands.
2nd. That as our settlements must be attended with some evils to them, it is our duty to give them compensation for those evils by imparting the truths of Christianity and the arts of civilized life.

. . . Finally, how must we now retrace our steps? and what are the most judicious modes of securing to them some portion of their own land, etc. . . .

These are principles that are not yet fully established.

The unfortunate Nigerian expedition, attempting to plant a model colony in Africa, cast a shadow on Buxton's

last years, but his native cheerfulness re-asserted itself in hoping that God would regard the motive.⁷

In the main his public objects were crowned with signal success, and a life full of accomplishment enabled him to say "Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace."

His final illness was what was called in those days a slow decline, beginning in 1843 with attacks of extreme weakness and exhaustion, and terminating in February 1845. It ran a closely parallel course with the lingering illness of his famous sister-in-law, Elizabeth Fry, and the two who had so often been harnessed together in the causes of reform exchanged many letters of mutual comfort to brace each other for the foreseen end. At first he had some hope of her recovery, and set down in his journal "O, Lord I beseech thee to restore this most beloved sister, so that she may be permitted to return to her important career, and that her ears may again be attentive to the cry of the miserable of the earth." But as the months passed he had no more hope for her than for himself, and in expressing frequent gratitude that he had no actual pain to bear, he wrote, "we have one heavy family cloud—the illness long-continued and grievously painful of our beloved sister, Mrs. Fry. She has been for some months unable to walk or stand, and is deeply afflicted in body."

One of the last expressions of his old joy in life was wrung from him a few days before he died by a letter painfully written to him by Mrs. Fry's failing hand: "I must try to express a little of the love and sympathy I feel

⁷ The expedition, of three ships, and 301 persons, 108 of which were Negroes, was backed both by government and by private subscription. Buxton and Samuel Hoare subscribed heavily. The expedition met with promising success, established a model farm and settlement, and made treaties both for trading and to abolish the slave-trade with a number of native chiefs for 300 miles along the Niger. But the climate was too unwholesome for white men, and after the loss of 41 men by fever, many others ill, the expedition withdrew. No Negroes took the fever.

with and for thee. . . . How much we have been one in heart, and how much one in our objects! . . . My love to you and your children and children's children is great and earnest; my desire and prayer is that grace, mercy and peace may rest upon you in time and to all eternity!"

Almost his last words—dreaming apparently of some Christianising settlement in Africa—were "I am ready to undertake the working part!" After all, Buxton was himself the best example of one of his favorite maxims to his sons—"Let it be your first study to teach the world that you are not wood and straw—*some iron in you.*"

REFERENCE BOOKS

- Memoirs of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, Bart. by his son, Charles Buxton, Esq 1849
 History of the Abolition of the Slave Trade by Thomas Clarkson.
 The Slavery of the British West India Colonies delineated as it exists both in law and practice by James Stephen

Timothy Nicholson, Candle of the Lord
Walter C. Woodward

XIV

TIMOTHY NICHOLSON, CANDLE OF THE LORD

Rufus Jones is fond of quoting, "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord." It is a striking figure, and is finely interpretative of the Quaker conception of the Christian life. Himself illuminated by the light of Christ within, Christ's man goes out to radiate the divine light to the dark places of earth.

In this figure and in its implications, is epitomized the creative history of the Society of Friends. As a "church organization" carrying on the various phases of religious work, this small body of Christian believers has not been conspicuously successful. Other and larger denominations are trained and equipped to do these things much better. It is as individual candles of the Lord, lit from a common and never failing light, that Friends have made a distinctive contribution to the world.

Quakerism arose in the seventeenth century as the residuary legatee of those spiritual and brotherhood movements which had flowed deep through the Christian centuries as an expression of the mystical, the experimental and the prophetic in religion as against the formal, the priestly and the ecclesiastical. It came as a vigorous protest against the unreality of religion in Protestant England, calling men to a direct and inward experience of Christ and his way of life as distinguished from religion as a creed and a profession.

The creative principle of the Friends was that of the Inward Light, the light of Christ within—that of God implanted in every human soul, through which personal communion with the Divine may be experienced. It was this inner, mystical fellowship that Friends cultivated so effectively; a fellowship that was so real to them that they were able to sit serene and silent in their meetings, in rapt contemplation of the divine goodness, while a bedlam of opposition raged without and even among them. “In the silence of their meetings they became hushed, attuned, adjusted to God, from whom came the rising tides of human sympathy.”¹

The rising tides of human sympathy! Here we have the ruling passion of Quakerism. Here were no mere introspective, passive, escape-seeking mystics, but partakers of the life and passion of Christ—a passion that sent them forth to follow Him into the byways of human need and suffering. The human heart, the shrine of the divine, became sacred. An outrage against that shrine was an outrage against God himself; hence nothing that had to do with the welfare of men could be foreign to the heart of God. The life and soul of man should be untrammelled, as far as possible, from physical privations and from violence, free from all injustice, free from the compulsion of conformity, that the Inward Light might freely illumine. To work thus for the human good was to serve God in the fullest sense by extending the kingdom of heaven among men. Moreover, this Quaker principle of the Inward Light was not a selective, but a universal light which shone in varying degrees in the hearts of all men, regardless of color, race, creed, nation, or material circumstance. Thus came the abiding sense of human

¹ Alice Heald Mendenhall in *Some Social Aspects of the Society of Friends in the 17th and 18th Centuries*.

brotherhood. The true Quaker became the social servant of all humanity.

What a convincing example did George Fox, the founder, set for those who followed him! We see him exhorting justices to deal fairly with the lowly; striving to correct abuses in criminal procedure and prison administration; petitioning the Protector and Parliament to provide work for the unemployed, both as remedial of want and as preventive of crime; advocating humane treatment of the insane; admonishing gentle treatment and eventual emancipation of slaves; establishing the "Meeting for Sufferings," still functioning in England, to relieve the unfortunate, champion the oppressed and to aid those suffering for the cause of Truth.

This heritage of the Founder, so rich in human sympathy and helpfulness, has never failed of inheritors. Practically every phase of human welfare and social righteousness has found its pioneer champions among Friends. Representative of this noble succession of saints are: John Bellers, who joined with the scientific spirit of the economist, the practical program of the social reformer; the Tukes, pioneers in the enlightened care of the mentally ill; John Woolman, a Quaker St. Francis and friend of freedom; versatile William Allen, known as "the unaccredited ambassador to all humanity"; Joseph Sturge, plenipotentiary of world peace; Elizabeth Fry, beloved angel of the prisons and her American counterpart, Elizabeth Comstock; John Bright, champion of the rights of the poor and eloquent voice of justice and peace; Lucretia Mott, courageous advocate of righteous but unpopular causes.

In the direct line of this group of honored social servants comes this Middle Western American Quaker, Timothy Nicholson. He embodies in a remarkable way, not only

the intelligent and effective concern which one or more Friends had for this or that cause, but the collective concerns of all his illustrious predecessors. There is not a single social interest represented by those just named that his life and service did not touch.

As we pursue the inspiring story of his useful life we shall find him bending his energies in behalf of world peace, whether by promoting conferences for its consideration or bringing his influence to bear upon public officials for the shaping of policies of conciliation. He had a commanding position of respect with men in public and official life, suggestive of William Allen and Joseph Sturge. Following the Civil War he gave himself to the cause of the freedmen of the South with an abandon of sacrifice that was worthy the devotion of a Woolman. First as a teacher, and then for the greater part of his life as an active associate in school and college administration, he made an important contribution to both private and public education. In his effective efforts for temperance reform and prohibition, he blazed new trails in the Quaker field of social reform. Most notable of all, perhaps, was his outstanding influence upon public charitable, correctional and penal institutions, in which work he combined the concerns of a Bellers, the Tukes and an Elizabeth Fry.

Timothy Nicholson was born November 2, 1828, in Albemarle County, North Carolina. In the truest sense of the term he was well born. His Quaker ancestors had suffered in New England for their faith, and his parents, Josiah and Anna White Nicholson, were worthy of their heritage. Theirs was a comfortable and prosperous home, Josiah Nicholson being an industrious and successful farmer, yet a largely self-sufficing household in accordance with the domestic economy of that day in which all

members of the family participated. It was a typical Quaker home marked by rugged virtues and simple faith, in which the children were carefully nurtured in a spiritual atmosphere. Timothy Nicholson was highly appreciative of his godly parents, "who lovingly but firmly guided and trained my restless and impulsive spirit in the good way."

Thus was laid the foundation of long periods of active service in the Society of Friends. Of the four brothers in the family who flowered to maturity, William, Timothy, Josiah and John, all held many positions of responsibility in their respective Yearly Meetings, in which three served as Presiding Clerk and the fourth as Clerk of the Executive Committee.

As elsewhere in the extension of Quaker Settlement, education and religion went hand in hand in the Piney Woods community. In the absence of public schools, a Quarterly Meeting academy was established at Belvidere when Timothy was five years old, his father taking a leading part in starting and maintaining the school. This academy, with teachers secured from among New England Friends, gave the Nicholson children and their cousins and friends, their early years of schooling.

At the age of eighteen, Timothy went to Providence, Rhode Island, as his elder brother had done before him and his younger brothers did later, to enter Friends Boarding School, later to be known as the Moses Brown School. Here he not only received valuable training but made lasting friendships that did much to mould and shape his career of usefulness.

On completing his school work there he returned home with the desire to establish himself on the farm and take the burden of its management largely from the shoulders of his father who was in failing health. This would be a pleasure as well as a filial duty for he liked farming and

planned to devote his life to it. What, therefore, was his disappointment and dismay when his father, backed by the school committee, laid upon him the principalship of the academy! The school had fallen on lean days of late, and it seemed that a temporary closing would soon become permanent unless efficient leadership were promptly secured.

The prompt response of the boy—he was not yet twenty-one—became characteristic of the man. As a matter of duty presented, he put aside his own plans and assumed the task proposed—and assumed it whole-heartedly and vigorously. The young schoolmaster proved himself so versatile and resourceful that the academy soon not only recovered lost ground but grew and widened its constituency so that an addition had to be built and a teacher added in the person of Timothy's younger brother, John. In addition to the satisfaction brought by so successful an administration, rich personal compensation came to the young Friend for having given up the farm for the school-room: following his close association with the family of the Superintendent and Matron of the academy, John and Mary White, he won the hand of their eldest daughter, Sarah, to whom he was married in 1853.

Most Friends of the great emigration from the Carolinas trekked north and west over the difficult, frontier line of travel which formed the hypotenuse of the triangle of Quaker settlement. Contrary to this rule, Timothy Nicholson and family reached the West by way of the Haran of Philadelphia Quakerism! This is how it came about.

In the winter of 1854-55 Haverford College decided to open a preparatory department, and the management was seeking a competent teacher to assume its direction. It was natural that the quest should lead toward the young

man who had revived the waning fortunes of the academy at Belvidere and who had administered that school so successfully for six years. After the young headmaster had outlined the policy he would wish to pursue if he should undertake the responsibility, he was appointed to the task. Following four years of effective service in this capacity he was urged to become Superintendent and Business Manager at Haverford, which he accepted on the understanding that ere long he was to respond to the call of the west.

Following six happy and fruitful years at Haverford, the family removed in the troublesome years of 1861 to Richmond, Indiana, whither Timothy's brother John had preceded them. There the brothers joined in the book store business with which Timothy was actively associated until his death in 1924.

In 1861, Richmond was a town of approximately six thousand people. It had been settled by Friends, White-water Monthly Meeting having been organized in 1809, and the Yearly Meeting, which was held at Richmond, in 1821. Although the Friendly population had been largely supplemented by a large influx of German Lutherans, Richmond was still known as the Quaker City of the West. It was a strategic choice of location, from which was to radiate for a period of sixty-three years, the beneficent and nation-wide influence of Timothy Nicholson, Master Quaker.

This influence was not radiated from any high or exalted station to which he had been elevated and which gave him prestige. It radiated from the shop keeper's counter. Though diligent in business, Timothy Nicholson did not allow it to interfere with his service for the common good. He kept business where it belonged—in the place of servant rather than of master. It was thus that the little

office room in the store became a holy place—a shrine of loving helpfulness.

Before turning attention to the many human areas in which this Candle of the Lord let the Light shine, it is pertinent to review the times which matched the man. The very year of his birth, 1828, was epochal. It marked a political revolution in the young Republic by the elevation to the Presidency of a rough and ready son of the West—that West which was conscious of its growing importance and impatient of restraint. A new national era was presaged. Spreading rapidly across the political sky was the black and portentous cloud of slavery, that sacred institution of the South whose extension was insistently demanded. It was in that same year of 1828, significantly enough, that Calhoun framed his doctrine of nullification, which, within three decades, came to fruition in the harvest of secession and civil strife.

The year 1834 saw the invention of a machine which was of almost the significance to the agricultural North and West that the cotton-gin had been to the agricultural South. It was the McCormick reaper, among the first of a long line of farming implements that were to transform the frontier into a vast granary and establish in free territory, the promised land of the southern Quakers, a sturdy, liberty-loving, productive people as a foil to the rising, slave-dependent regime of the South. King Cotton was to do its obeisance in the lean years of rebellion and reconstruction to the upright sheaves of northern wheat fields.

While the West and South remained primarily rural, a complex industrial life was springing up in the East. Great manufacturing industries were getting under way, and as people flocked to the factories new urban conditions, scarcely recognized yet as problems, were developed.

Prosperity was already exacting its toll in the inhuman labor conditions involved. In the rapidly growing cities municipal affairs became often a scandal, as the public welfare was jeopardized by mismanagement and corruption.

During these eventful years, the popular movement for public education was getting under way under the leadership of such prophets as Horace Mann. Contributing largely to the principles of the new education was the English Quaker educator, Joseph Lancaster. In the newer West, where the pioneers were busy contesting with nature's forces for supremacy, the cause of education naturally lagged. This fact, combined with the divorce of religion and education in the public schools, was to lead Timothy Nicholson into a field of influence of far-reaching consequence.

It was in this period, too, that a general interest was aroused in behalf of social betterment. Temperance reform was assuming the ardor of a crusade. Another reform struck at the custom of confining the insane in ordinary prisons, hospitals being gradually established for their care and treatment. The searchlight of public concern was also turned upon the wretched conditions surrounding the prisons, the public almshouses, and the criminals in prisons. Champions of working children in the factories arose and a beginning was made in securing the passage of labor laws for their protection. Impulses of humanity were stirred more widely than all, perhaps, in behalf of the helpless southern slave. And along with the plea for the paupers, the insane, the criminals and the slaves, a few early voices were raised for justice and freedom for women, though as yet they were as voices crying in the wilderness of public disapproval.

However, in the era of business and industrial expansion

and reckless speculation, in the founding of great financial enterprises and in the centralization of wealth, all of which followed the Civil War, there was a noticeable reaction from these higher, altruistic impulses. Abuses against humanity were tolerated all too complacently. The rights of man sorely needed courageous champions.

In summary, then, the early development of this new country was accomplished in a reign of individualism. With virgin resources abundant and land awaiting settlers, freedom and the pursuit of happiness were open to all. The capable, the resolute and the hardy succeeded, and the attention shown the less fortunate was individual rather than governmental. Having guaranteed equal rights to achievement, the State had not conceived much further responsibility for human welfare. With the coming of the industrial era through the age of steam-driven machinery, the *laissez faire* theory was soon shown to be pitifully inadequate. Human wreckage was strewn about in a way to demand attention, and the growth of a social consciousness and social responsibility followed. Philanthropically inclined men and women began agitating for man's *humanity* to man, with the cooperation of the State. And so the stage was set for a Timothy Nicholson, who matched the need with an all-inclusive concern and the capacity to bring things to pass.

Two years after his arrival in Richmond, his feet were set upon the highway of social service. After the Proclamation of Emancipation was issued by President Lincoln, the suffering and destitution of the slaves, now called "freedmen," were so severe as to appeal to the sympathy of northern people and especially to Friends, who had always shown kindness to Negroes and Indians. Moreover, Friends, many of whom had been excused from military

service on account of their peace principles, saw here an opportunity for constructive alternative service.

At the sessions of Indiana Yearly Meeting held in 1863, a committee was appointed to

give special attention to the relief of the physical necessities of those who had recently been released from slavery, and to their advancement in knowledge and religion, and to receive all funds which may be contributed for this purpose, and to see that they are properly applied; to employ suitable agents to attend to their distribution; to judge of the qualifications of those who are proposed or who may offer themselves to devote their time to the work of visiting or residing among and instructing the freedmen, and otherwise to labor in every way they can to further the good cause. This committee will be an executive body and meet regularly and frequently, keep minutes of their proceedings, and appoint a secretary, treasurer and such other officers as may be found necessary.

There are clear implications here of an enormous amount of work to be performed by the Committee chosen.

Timothy Nicholson was made secretary of the committee. The Union armies occupied numerous points in various southern states, and many thousands of freedmen—men, women and children—gathered around these places of rendezvous for protection. During the very first year of the committee's activity, twenty-four agents, teachers and missionaries were selected and sent to minister to those unfortunates. From Maine to Iowa, Friends sent clothes and miscellaneous supplies, in addition to money, to be distributed among them. The work devolving upon the secretary was said by him to be the most strenuous of his whole life. The amount of correspondence was tremendous, and it was painstakingly cared for in long hand, with Timothy Nicholson serving as his own office staff. It was a remarkable piece of relief and reconstruction, heroically administered at great personal sacrifice.

The Quaker prison reformers in England have had their counterparts in America, but only in Indiana, it appears, did Friends officially and as a body undertake prison reform. In 1867, the Meeting for Sufferings of Indiana Yearly Meeting appointed a committee of six, of which Timothy Nicholson was a member, "to organize a system for the reformation of juvenile offenders and the improvement of prison discipline." The Committee was called into action because of the general belief that inefficiency, cruelty, vice and corruption characterized the management of Indiana's penal and correctional institutions.

This epoch-making Committee, widely credited with having been largely influential in creating public sentiment and in inaugurating far-reaching reforms in the Indiana penal system, continued its active work for forty-two years before it was finally released on its own request in 1909. The one member who served continuously throughout this period was Timothy Nicholson. The Committee was organized with Charles F. Coffin, Clerk of the Yearly Meeting, as secretary. After his removal from the state in 1884, his mantle of leadership fell upon Timothy Nicholson.

It may easily be imagined under what difficulties and indirection such a committee would work in striving to arouse the public conscience on one hand, and in attacking the forces of political corruption on the other. "We were nothing more than citizens," said Timothy in recalling those early days of struggle. "We had no authority. We could visit these institutions but were not allowed to investigate their management. We could go to the Legislature and represent to the members some things we thought ought to be done." However, by visits and personal observation, the Committee continually gathered

a large fund of information which was given to the public.

Year after year, the Committee faithfully made its report of progress and reaction, of success and defeat. In the words of Alexander Johnson, first Secretary of the Indiana Board of State Charities and nationally famed leader in prison reform, those "annual reports made to the Representative Body form a comprehensive history of prison and other reform in Indiana, during nearly fifty years of wise, patient and patriotic effort."

Slowly but surely, the results of this faithful work of informing and educating the public began to tell. First, the Committee was partly and perhaps largely responsible for establishing at Plainfield a reformatory school for boys, thus separating juvenile delinquents from hardened criminals. The chairman of the Yearly Meeting Committee was made President of the Board of Trustees. In 1873 was opened a separate reformatory institution for women and girls, with a woman Friend as Superintendent. Instigated by agitation on the part of the Committee, investigation was made of the men's state prison, resulting first in shocking disclosures and in greatly improved administration. From 1871 to 1889, the Yearly Meeting Committee waged its major campaign to secure the creation of a responsible agency to have under its scrutiny and general oversight the administration of the penal and eleemosynary institutions of the State. It was a difficult and discouraging task. By tireless and persistent effort, however, in the face of opposition on the part of the politicians, and of indifference on the part of the people, public opinion was finally made effective and the State Legislature enacted a law creating the State Board of Charities.

As a member, and the most influential member, of this important Board, Timothy Nicholson entered upon the most significant and creative work of his long career of

public service. In the field of public charitable and correctional institutions, this period marked the flower and fruitage of the preceding years of seed sowing and cultivation. "Throughout the nineteen years of his membership and for long years afterward, Timothy Nicholson, wise, courageous, steadfast, was the Board's guiding spirit. He was the pilot who through long experience knew the rocks and shoals, and he guided the craft into smooth waters and on to success." Thus spoke one who was intimately and officially associated with the work of the Board during these eventful years.

The Board was not clothed with executive powers by the bill of enactment. It was advisory only and was aptly characterized as a continuous investigating committee. Its accomplishments were to depend not upon administrative authority, but upon wisdom and tact—upon a manifestation of that sweet reasonableness that would gain the cooperation of officials and secure the public confidence. Apart from his peculiar fitness for this responsible and delicate task, it was eminently fitting that the head of the Quaker Committee which had borne the burden of the fight for its creation should be on the new Board; and especially so since in those pioneer years of agitation, the reform proposals were frequently referred to rather derisively by the politicians as "Quaker measures." For the man who championed them, however, they had the utmost respect.

In organizing for inclusive and effective work, the Board divided itself into a number of committees. It was on that of prisons and criminal affairs that Timothy Nicholson began his official service. He found that the performance of his duties required about forty days out of the year. In a word, he was giving more than his tithe of time to the public welfare.

Were an appraisal of his work attempted in a sentence, it would be to the effect that he drove politics out of the management of the state institutions, changing the partisan plan of management to a non-partisan, merit system. Of course he did not accomplish such a feat single-handed, but he was the acknowledged leader in the struggle. When politicians went on the rampage, threatening to undo some of the reforms that had been hardly won, friends of the human welfare turned to the resourceful, judicious and courageous Quaker to check and to confound them. And rarely did they turn to him in vain. The bane of wise, beneficent administration was "politics," and to hold the politicians at bay was to keep open the road toward progress.

When a particularly difficult task was to be performed in connection with the work of the Board, it was natural for the members to look to Timothy Nicholson. On one such occasion when criticism and reprimand were required, the Board turned to him to perform the unpleasant duty. In accepting the responsibility he said in effect: "Sometimes we Friends have to use very plain language. But when a duty like this is to be performed, I have long ago learned to first dip my sword in oil in order that it may heal as well as cut."

Timothy Nicholson was admirably qualified as an inspector of state institutions. He was a keen observer, and while he observed critically he also observed sympathetically and constructively. He was intensely practical with all his idealism, and was fertile with helpful suggestions. Well-intended officials found in him a counsellor and friend. Not only by personal inspection but by written inquiry did he keep in touch with conditions in the state institutions. He followed up his visits by correspondence, thus keeping informed on such situations and develop-

ments as were of particular concern to him. It is a marvel how he was able to deal effectively with so many varied interests, for it must be remembered that while he was so deeply engrossed with the welfare of these public institutions of the State, he was also devoting attention to other fields of social activity.

In 1896, Timothy Nicholson served as President of the Indiana State Conference of Charities and Corrections, and at its annual meeting, held in his home city, he took as the subject of the presidential address, "Thirty Years of Struggle," in which he ably reviewed the trials and achievements experienced in the cause of human welfare in Indiana. The address made a deep impression and was widely quoted. His official connection with this field of work brought him into the broader national arena. He frequently attended the national meetings both of the National Prison Association and the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, in the business of which he participated unobtrusively but influentially. He thus formed acquaintance with the leading authorities of the country, whose friendship he cherished through the remainder of his life.

Recognition and tribute came to the Quaker yeoman of the human good when, in 1901, Timothy Nicholson was made President of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections. He directed the affairs and business of the organization with his accustomed ability, and the national meeting over which he presided was notably successful.

In his eightieth year, Timothy Nicholson resigned as a member of the Indiana Board of State Charities, naturally supposing that his time of active service would draw shortly to a close. It was far otherwise. While relieved of his official responsibilities, he seemed released for an even

wider service as counsellor-at-large which he was permitted to render for sixteen years.

The 1915 meeting of the Indiana Conference of Charities and Corrections was held in Richmond. Its "headliner" was Dr. Edward T. Devine, nationally and internationally known in this field, who declared that his real purpose in coming to Richmond was to tell Timothy Nicholson to his face what he thought of him! Whereupon, reviewing the work of his long career, the speaker paid our Friend this discerning tribute: "He has wisely and shrewdly and sincerely and simply and courageously and persistently worked to protect the weak, to cure the sick, to teach the teachable, to restrain the perverse, to set round about the wards of the State a strong wall of defense—not walls of masonry or iron bars, but a great defense of helping hands, restraining, guiding, protecting hands, which yet make way eagerly for the cured, the restored one, to take his place in society."

On his removal to Richmond, Timothy Nicholson took an active part in the temperance movement, in which he was soon accorded the leadership. While working earnestly for the reform in principle and for more inclusive prohibitory legislation, he addressed himself with vigor to local conditions, seeing that existing laws were enforced so far as possible. Local liquor interests and saloon keepers knew him but too well, if not always wisely. On one occasion a German saloon keeper whom our alert Friend had thwarted, on being asked what he thought of Timothy Nicholson replied: "Vell, I tink Meester Nicholson is a wery goot man if he vould only let liquor alone." Timothy used to relate this incident with great glee, for with all his crusading zeal he had a keen sense of humor.

He was naturally active in furthering the various temperance measures introduced in the State Legislature,

the enactment of which marked Indiana's long struggle for emancipation from the liquor forces. An independent in politics where causes dear to his heart were involved, he did not hesitate to oppose any candidate who was not sound upon this or that moral issue. The general knowledge of this fact, together with a wholesome appreciation of Timothy's wide influence, tended to put the fear of God into the hearts of office-seeking politicians.

When, in 1898, the Indiana Anti-Saloon League was organized, Timothy Nicholson's leadership in the state was recognized by his election as President. This occurred in the very midst of his active career as a member of the Indiana Board of State Charities, to the work of which he was giving such faithful attention. None the less he gave a similar devotion to the leadership of the newly organized Prohibition forces. He was retained as President of the Anti-Saloon League as long as he lived, presiding over its deliberations in annual meeting as late as in 1921 when he was in his ninety-third year.

This was not a mere titular, nominal leadership, not even during the later years of Timothy's life. His grasp of conditions, his broad experience and his ability to interpret a situation, were so well recognized that he was continually called upon for counsel and guidance.

All the while he was working aggressively for state-wide Prohibition, he was looking forward to the larger, national goal. To this end he kept in close touch with United States senators and congressmen, especially those from his own state, who were often his acquaintances and friends. While always addressing them courteously, he sometimes felt impelled to deal with them with that Friendly forthrightness for which he was well known. Timothy Nicholson fought the good fight for moral reform without manifesting bitterness toward those he was compelled to

oppose. And they, appreciating his high sense of conviction and duty, rarely failed to accord him due respect.

Another Quaker testimony to which Timothy Nicholson gave active allegiance was the fundamental one of peace. To him, as to all deeply rooted Friends, peace was more than a theory of international relationships. It was a principle growing out of his inner life. His conviction concerning right world relationships was based, first, in his belief in the divine implanting in the hearts of men; and second, on the experience of his associations with his neighbors, and on examples in Quaker history, notably in Friendly relations with the Indians, of how peace begets peace. He was not a doctrinaire pacifist, therefore, any more than he was a doctrinaire reformer in any phase of social betterment. He was a pacifist in the literal sense—he was a maker of peace.

While not a prominent leader in this field of reform to the extent to which he led in other fields of Friendly concern, he gave it much attention. He heartily supported those who were in the forefront in the advocacy of the principles of peace, and those who exemplified its principles in a practical demonstration of service. On the one hand, he energetically encouraged all proposals providing for the peaceful and judicial settlement of questions arising between nations. On the other, he gave practical proof of his approval of those measures of helpfulness and relief which make for friendship and good will between peoples and nations.

Because of their fundamental opposition to war, Friends have naturally faced the problem of conflicting loyalties in times of national conflict. Not only to define and protect their own status in the matter, but also to establish so far as possible the rights of conscience and to win recognition for the principle of Peace, they have urged the

legal right of exemption from military service. As chairman of the Committee on Legislation appointed by the Five Years Meeting of Friends in America, Timothy Nicholson rendered characteristically aggressive and effective service in this connection in 1902 and 1903. He organized the Friendly sentiment over the country, and focusing it upon Congress, secured an amendment to the pending Militia bill which exempted from military service members of well recognized pacifist denominations. "Probably never before," declared Timothy, "was the testimony of Friends against war brought out so prominently before Congress."

In the period of nearly three years following the outbreak of the World War, Timothy Nicholson worked valiantly, not only to keep the United States from entering the conflict, but also to lay the basis for constructive peace in the future. Then, as always, he opposed armaments and "big stick" navies, and was diligent in pointing out to national legislators the folly and danger of such policies.

When the United States entered the war in 1917, a grave situation confronted Friends, especially the young men of draft age. To the aforementioned exemption was added the trouble-making clause that the exemption did not extend to such service as the President should declare to be non-combatant. Because of this last provision, conscientious objectors had to report with others to the military encampments. Many young Friends not only declined combative service but felt they could not accept what was designated as non-combative which put them under the command of the military. It was an exceedingly trying and difficult situation for them, in which they were in great need of Friendly counsel and sympathy. Timothy Nicholson, despite his eighty-nine years, visited camp to help young Friends work out their problems.

Before long the American Friends Service Committee was organized and within a short time was sending a steady stream of young men and women across the Atlantic to do relief and reconstruction work in the war-stricken areas. Timothy Nicholson took an active part in supporting this work of mercy, helping to stimulate interest and a sense of responsibility among Friends and appealing for funds with which to carry it on. Not only during the war but in the years immediately following, when the Quaker work of relief was extended into the "enemy" countries, did Timothy actively support the world-wide program of "peaceful penetration," after the manner of Friends.

His passion for Peace did not abate nor did his activities cease as life's sands ran lower and lower. Timothy Nicholson was intensely interested in world organization as a preventive of war, and six months before his death, when in his ninety-sixth year, he was writing to influential members of the United States Senate, urging this country's entry into the World Court.

The maintenance of an effective spiritual democracy as espoused by Friends implies adequate education. Enlightened concerns are not wont to come from uninformed minds, and discerning Friends have always held that the light shed by the candle of the Lord may be increased by properly trimming the wick.

Timothy Nicholson considered education as basic to all his manifold humanitarian and religious activities. In a day of intense religious zeal tending towards obscurantism, he saw no incompatibility between the highest intellectual culture and the deepest spiritual life. On this background of conviction and experience, his own evaluation of his life work may be easily understood. He considered the most important service of his long career to have been

rendered through his close relation to Earlham College.

This service began in 1862, when, in the year following his arrival in Richmond, the Yearly Meeting made him a member of the Earlham College Committee or Board of Trustees. Except for a term of three years when he retired because of poor health, he served in that capacity until 1914, and continued to be a tower of strength till the day of his death in his ninety-sixth year. His well-rounded ability made his contribution to the College an inclusive one. His experience as a teacher made him appreciative of the strictly academic problems involved. As an administrator at Haverford College he had a background of business management that was helpful. Being easily accessible, he was in such frequent consultation with the college authorities that his services during the many years of his connection are immeasurable. When, in 1922, the college celebrated the seventy-fifth anniversary of its establishment, Timothy Nicholson was an outstanding figure in the observance. The senior class, in dedicating its class book to him, characterized him as exemplifying in every way the spirit of the college which he had so faithfully served for fifty-nine years. On Commencement Day the college honored itself by conferring upon him the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws. In addition to his intensive interest in Earlham, he was active in promoting educational conferences among American Friends, and in stimulating educational interests wherever possible.

Timothy Nicholson's educational activities were not confined to the Society of Friends. On two occasions he served as a member of the Board of the Indiana State Normal School by appointment of the Governor. By reason of his leadership in Bible School work in his local meeting, he became prominent in interdenominational work, becoming President of the County, and then of the

State Sunday School Convention. He was also a member of the Executive Committee of the International Sunday School Convention, and was a delegate to the World Conference in 1893.

In a large way, all of Timothy Nicholson's work was educational in character. He approached the various problems presented to him from the educational viewpoint. His work in connection with the state institutions involved phases of education, such as the establishment of the school for boys at Plainfield and the school for girls at Clermont. He was always interested in Indian and Negro education, and in discussing the general problem of the Negro not long before his death, he said, "It is a Christian education that the Negro needs." Indeed it was Timothy Nicholson's dominating conviction that Christian education was the paramount need of all—a conviction so strong that the educational concern commanded his active interest and effective support throughout his long and busy career.

Too often, men who give themselves to public service have little part in the active life of the church with which they are affiliated. Their absorption in the one seems to wean them from the other. This is most unfortunate and partly explains why religious ideals do not more readily permeate our public life. Public men wander too far from the base of their spiritual supplies. Timothy Nicholson furnished a striking exception to this tendency. Busily occupied as he always was with public affairs, his first allegiance was to the Society of Friends and to its own immediate work. His meeting activities furnished the training ground for his wider service.

Quaker seer and statesman that he was, Timothy Nicholson had a vision of how the Society of Friends, through the extension of its ideals, might serve the world;

and he labored valiantly and wisely to help make the vision a reality. He was highly influential toward this end in his own Yearly Meeting, and was also a wise and dominating figure for years in the national grouping, known as the Five Years Meeting of Friends in America. Wherever he was and in whatever capacity, his presence gave light.

Rich and effective as was Timothy Nicholson's contribution to human betterment, it is not possible as yet to appraise it adequately. Were he to reappear in the flesh today he would be deeply distressed at the setback suffered by causes so dear to his heart. In his own state he would find that the politicians have torn down the barriers which he and others had painstakingly erected for the protection and sound administration of state institutions. He would find state and nation again "wide open" to the ravages of the liquor traffic which he had battled so courageously. He would find his nation committed to unprecedented armaments and the world ablaze with strife. But while distressed, he would not be discomfited. Believing in the invincibility of truth, he would rekindle the light that it might shine with yet greater brilliance where darkness seems to prevail. And so must we who would follow in his train.

Stages in Spiritual Development
as Recorded in
Quaker Journals

Howard H. Brinton

XV

STAGES IN SPIRITUAL DEVELOPMENT AS RECORDED IN QUAKER JOURNALS

Quaker journals provide a source of material for the study of religion on its inward personal side which is without parallel. Few students of religious phenomena have noted that one of the smallest of the Christian sects has produced a series of spiritual autobiographies which are not only surprising in number, but, for the most part, profound and penetrating in their self-analysis. The Journals of George Fox and John Woolman are comparatively well known and are entitled to the pre-eminence which they have attained, but there are scores of Quaker journals which, in varying degrees, deserve the attention of the reader in search of spiritual food or of the student in search of religious data.

The object of this essay is to show, in a general way and without an attempt at criticism or evaluation, the principal stages and the main turning points in the religious life as described by the writers of these Quaker autobiographies. Approximately one hundred journals are considered. They range in date from the middle of the seventeenth century to the middle of the nineteenth when the stream begins to grow thin and biographies appear more often than autobiographies. Only those journals are dealt with which are fairly complete; which begin with childhood and end shortly before the death of the writer. This excludes a type of literature common in

the seventeenth century in which the author deals only with his convincement to Friends' principles. The quotations are selected because they are typical.

The journal was the most characteristic form of Quaker composition. Because the function of the Quaker preacher was to call men from an external religion of forms and creeds to a religion of inner personal experience, one way to do this was to describe personal experience or, as an old phrase puts it, "to set forth the dealings of the Lord with us." The journals under consideration here were written by men and women who travelled widely in the work of the ministry, and who wrote for the same reasons that they preached. But there was an important difference. When they preached they were instruments of the Lord. There must be nothing of self in a Quaker sermon. Quaker meetings are not as a rule places for making confession. Yet the experiences of these ministers would be of value to those who sought to travel in the same path that they did, so the journals contain a record of pitfalls avoided, of revelations received, and even of disappointments and failures. The journals nearly all begin with an effort to reconcile the selflessness of the true Christian with a concern with personal detail without which autobiography would become a theoretical analysis of problems rather than the record of an individual life.

Not one of these Quaker journalists was a recluse. Such extraordinary ability at introspection as they exhibit is often associated with the lonely cell or hermitage, but these were men and women of affairs, usually heads of large families, involved in the normal responsibilities of home and livelihood. Nor were they individualists, as might be expected from their extraordinary emphasis on the inward. They developed a group consciousness which inspires every page of their writings and without which they could

not have been such intimate and organic parts of the Religious Society to which they belonged. There are painstaking accounts of self-examination which alternate with faithful descriptions of outward activity. It was no mere quietistic mysticism which sent forth such a minister as the delicate school mistress Martha Routh (1743-1817) to travel for three years over eleven thousand miles of pioneer roads in America. After traversing a trackless wilderness she could preach for an hour and a half to edification.

In most of the journals the turning points in spiritual progress are clearly indicated, "way marks to weary travelers" as John Griffith (1713-1776) calls them. In general, these turning points are not sharp, but long curves in which the direction of life is altered by degrees. There is nothing in the religion of the Society of Friends which requires a sudden change, though such change often occurs. It is probable that the similarity in the order and nature of the several stages is due, in some degree, to unconscious adherence to a pattern set by early journal-ists. A factor of much larger importance however is the fact that the Quakers had discovered a kind of life which tends to evolve according to a law of its own nature. The conceptual forms and patterns of this evolution are to some extent molded by current theology and philosophy in each successive period, but a comparison of the earliest with the latest journals does not reveal any serious differences in the character of the rungs of the spiritual ladder by which the soul makes its ascent.

In the spiritual progress of Quaker ministers as portrayed in these hundred journals the following stages appear; some journals do not show all of them, indeed several indicate only a few:

1. Divine revelations in childhood
2. Compunction over youthful frivolity
3. Period of search and conflict
4. Convincement
5. Conversion
6. Seasons of Discouragement
7. Entrance upon the Ministry
8. Adoption of plain dress, plain speech, and simple living
9. Curtailment of business
10. Advocacy of social reform

The adoption of social concerns, such as the abolition of slavery, prison reform, temperance, poor relief and the like is omitted from further consideration in this study. Such concerns appear at many different stages in various lives as they become increasingly sensitive to human needs. Few of these journalists were unidentified with general movements for social betterment even in an age when religion and social service were not as intimately associated as they are today.

1. *Divine Revelations in childhood*, "the time of innocence" as they called it, are often recorded in journals which aim at completeness. William Caton (1636-1665) wrote in the first journal to be published,—“While I was yet very young . . . being inspired with a divine principle, I did in those days sometimes feel the power of it overcoming my heart.”¹ He set a style which was generally followed after him. “In my early age I was sensible of the tender impressions of divine love” is the typical expression as written by Mary Haggart (1758-1840).² “I remember that at a very early age I experienced the operation of divine grace condemning me for evil and inciting

¹ *Journal of William Caton, The Friends' Library*, edited by William and Thomas Evans and published from 1837 to 1850, Volume IX, 435. In subsequent notes reference to journals published in *The Friends' Library* will be indicated as follows: F. L. IX, 435.

² F.L. VII, 432.

me to goodness," writes Samuel M. Janney (1801-1880)³ Thomas Scattergood (1748-1814) at six years of age, like many others, "was favored with seasons of serious thoughtfulness."⁴ Thomas Story (1662-1742) remembers an "early inclination to solitude."⁵ The age of seven to ten seems to have been the usual time for such divine visitations, though in the main these were not recognized for what they were. It is not surprising that genius in religion like genius in other lines should display itself in childhood.⁶ Such records of early experience may have been influenced by the Quaker belief that God is never at any age or place without His witness in the heart. It is evident that the Quaker ministers were, as a rule, highly sensitive as children and religiously minded at an early age.

2. *A period of youthful frivolity* seems to have been a definite stage in the experience of nearly all the journalists. The sins of this period, usually in the years from ten to fifteen though sometimes later, were generally attributed to the depravity of a "natural" disposition not yet aware of its sinfulness. A few typical expressions are: "My mind was drawn out after the vain plays, customs, fashions, and will-worship of the world,"⁷—(James Dickinson, 1659-1741); "I took great pleasure in airy and vain company,"⁸—(David Ferris, 1707-1779); "The impetuous waves of youthful passion too often carried the weak wayward young man out of the straight narrow way,"⁹—(Edward Hicks, 1780-1849); "The vivacity of my natural

³ *Journal*, p. 6.

⁴ *F.L.* VIII, 3.

⁵ *F.L.* X, 1.

⁶ "Youths who achieve eminence are distinguished in childhood by behavior which indicates an unusually high I. Q." Catharine M. Cox, *The Early Mental Traits of Three Hundred Geniuses*, p. 216.

⁷ *F.L.* XII, 370.

⁸ *Memoirs*, p. 18.

⁹ *Journal*, p. 50.

disposition often led me beyond natural bounds,"¹⁰
—(Sarah Hunt, 1797–1889).

No journal records misdeeds more serious than "frothiness of behavior" and fondness for such things as sport, music, card-playing, dancing, jesting, and "vain and loose conversation." Hannah Taylor (1774–1812) speaks for all when she says, "I felt thankful that I had been preserved from gross sins in the days of my youth, but I was convicted of much lightness and emptiness from having given way to the natural liveliness of my disposition."¹¹ One wonders whether those grave journalists would have been the able persons that they were had they not possessed this "natural liveliness" which they so regretfully record.

3. *The Period of Search and Conflict* follows the discovery of something in the soul that is not satisfied by "youthful frivolity." This period generally lasts from the middle teens to the early twenties. There is much variation and in some cases conflict never ceases. Some, more often women than men, feel this conflict only slightly, others experience it more intensely. With the Friends of the seventeenth century the period of conflict was often associated with a period of search when they sought out various preachers and sects in an effort to attain release from the inner struggle. The conflict is described in very much the same terms in all the journals from the earliest to the latest. The seventh chapter of Romans, in which Paul writes of his own inner conflict, furnished terms in which to describe these battles fought in the depths of the soul.

John Barclay (1797–1838) quotes:

¹⁰ *Journal*, p. 3.

¹¹ *Memoirs*, p. 6.

How to perform that which is good I find not; for the good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not that do I.¹²

Some journalists describe the struggle in terms of the children of Israel wandering in the wilderness seeking for the promised land.

I tried many ways to flee from him, but he followed me up as he did the children of Israel in their travels.

—Thomas Arnett (1791–1877) ¹³

A long wilderness had to be passed through before I could enjoy the land of promise. . . . I believe it is impossible for any mortal to understand or conceive the depth and intensity of these mental conflicts without having personally experienced some of them.

—George Richardson (1773–1863) ¹⁴

Another figure of speech is used by James Dickinson (1659–1741):

As I was careful to keep in the Light I came to see the kingdom rent from Saul and given to David though there was a long war between the house of Saul and the house of David.¹⁵

These conflicts often caused a considerable mental anguish.

Stephen Crisp (1628–1692), who had tried all the sects and found them wanting, writes:

In this furnace I toiled and labored and none knew my sorrows and griefs which at times were almost intolerable so that I wished I had never been born.¹⁶

¹² *F.L.* VI, 386.

¹³ *Journal*, p. 19.

¹⁴ *Journal*, xvi and xviii.

¹⁵ *F.L.* XII, 370.

¹⁶ *F.L.* XIV, 142.

Other typical descriptions of conflict are:

Oh, the many days of sorrow and nights of deep distress that I passed through as I lay wallowing in the filthiness of the flesh.¹⁷

—Rebecca Jones (1739–1817).

Days in vanity and rebellion, nights in horror and distress . . . I cried, I prayed, I repented, I sinned . . . I knew myself a prisoner but I hugged my chains.¹⁸

—Job Scott (1751–1793)

This “tossed state” is often described as the conflict of two “wills,” “powers,” or “seeds” in the soul.

I had never had before such a clear and undoubted sense of the two powers of light and life and of death and darkness.¹⁹

—William Evans (1787–1867).

John Whitehead makes this explanation of the struggle the subject of his pamphlet, *The Enmity between the Two Seeds* (1665).²⁰ The psychological characteristics and explanations of this condition are the subject of William James’ chapter on the “Divided Self” in his *Varieties of Religious Experience*, and C. G. Jung has ably described them in his writings. We need not consider this cleft in the soul as an exceptional or necessarily a pathological condition. Such divided states are the common lot of all persons in varying degrees. No personality is fully integrated. Our journalists were educated in a dualistic theology with a sharp distinction between natural and supernatural. Theology undoubtedly had a considerable influence upon the course as well as upon the interpretation of their inner experiences. They

¹⁷ *Journal*, p. 6.

¹⁸ *Journal*, p. 39.

¹⁹ *Journal*, 1870, p. 17.

²⁰ *The Written Gospel Labors of John Whitehead*. (London: 1704.)

faced a problem common to all men which took on desperate seriousness because of an unusually persistent determination to solve it. Who indeed has not faced this conflict between the will to do good and the will to do evil and found himself quite unable to reach a solution through his own power. Whether it be interpreted as a conflict between God and Satan for possession of the human soul, or a conflict between the "natural" earthly part of man and a divinely inspired Light within, or a conflict between a lower and higher self, or between a conscious and subconscious personality, it is in any case a very real thing. A religious group which has discovered a solution has made a definite contribution to the happiness of mankind.

Only through real conflict could real spiritual depth be won. Catherine Philips (1726-1794) writes:

I have it as an observation that I have seldom, if ever, seen any stand and arrive to any considerable degree of usefulness in the Church, whose foundation has not been deeply laid in afflictions and exercises.²¹

4. *Convincement* of the truth of Friends' principles is not to be confused with conversion, a word which applies only to the actual solution of the inner conflict. Convincement was, indeed, often only the beginning of conflict for it offered a vision of what might be in contrast to what really was. To those not already in membership with Friends it meant the intellectual acceptance of the Quaker interpretation of Christianity. "I was convinced in my judgement," says Luke Howard. Birthright members of the Society are just as subject to convincement as those who are not members, but to them it is more likely

²¹ *F.L.* XI, 192.

to occur gradually than as an event which has a definite date.

In 1697 John Banks wrote *An Epistle to Friends Shewing the Great Difference between a Convinced Estate and a Converted Estate and the Profession of Truth and the Possession Thereof.*²² Banks (1634-1710) was convinced at sixteen years of age, as he says, "by myself alone in the field." He travelled through "nights of Godly sorrow and spiritual pain for some years" and finally "waiting diligently in the light and keeping close to the power of God which is therein received I came to experience the work thereof in my heart in order to effect my freedom from bondage which *by degrees* went on and prospered in me."²³ George Whitehead (1636-1723) writes:

After I became settled in my mind and conscience to join in communion with said people, and to frequent their assemblies as aforesaid, the Lord by his Light and Grace fully persuaded me that without being *converted as well as convinced* and without being regenerated, sanctified and born again I could not enter his kingdom.²⁴

When William Edmundson was on his way to Ireland, Fox sent by him this brief message:

Friends in that which convinced you wait, that you may have that removed you are convinced of.²⁵

William Crouch (1628-1710) discovered that his conviction resulted only in "sin appearing exceedingly sinful." In his subsequent struggles he "saw that a distance is set between seed-time and harvest."²⁶ Finally

²² *Works*, p. 245.

²³ *F.L.* II, 9.

²⁴ *Memoirs*, 1832 ed., p. 37.

²⁵ *F.L.* II, 99.

²⁶ *F.L.* XI, 298.

convincement turned into conversion and the harvest was gathered.

Robert Barclay well describes the difference between convincement and conversion:

After this manner we desire therefore all that come among us to be proselyted, knowing that though thousands should be convinced in their understanding of all the truths we maintain, yet if they were not sensible of this inward life and their souls not changed from unrighteousness to righteousness they could add nothing to us. For this is that cement whereby we are joined as to the Lord, so to one another.²⁷

The instrument through which convincement took place was usually a sermon but sometimes it occurred through reading, as, for instance, in the case of Stephen Grellet (1773–1855) reading *No Cross, No Crown*, and not infrequently it occurred in a silent meeting. Of John Hall (1637–1719) his son wrote:

Presently the power of the Lord seized upon him and broke him down so that he was fully convinced of the blessed truth in that silent meeting.²⁸

George Keith, (1639–1716) the Quaker separatist, declares of the Quakers "that some of their chief Proselytes have published in print that after this manner was their conversion, viz,—neither by words, sound of Voice nor Sight nor any bodily Touch but simply by a feeling of the mighty power that exerted itself the first time they came into these silent meetings."²⁹

Balby Monthly Meeting records of Daniel Wheeler (1771–1840):

It is worthy of notice that . . . whilst attending the small and generally silent meetings of Woodhouse, Daniel Wheeler

²⁷ *Apology* Prop. XI, sec. VII.

²⁸ *F.L.* XIII, 98.

²⁹ *The Magick of Quakerism*, (1707), p. 51.

had felt the truth of our principles and yielded to the conviction.⁸⁰

Daniel Wheeler himself says, "I was convinced at sea—no human means was made use of." He thus defines the difference between convincement and conversion:

An individual thoroughly convinced of our principles and keeping close to that which has convinced him will undoubtedly, as he continues faithful, be converted by it.⁸¹

It often happened, however, that convincement and conversion were coincident or that either experience led to the other as an immediate consequence.

5. *Conversion* was the central event in the spiritual progress of the Quaker journalist. The word itself, however, is seldom found in the journals, probably because it tends to imply the kind of sudden change which is not stressed by Quaker theory to the same degree that it is stressed by some others, for example the Methodist. The Quakers maintained that God can always be found in the heart pleading for man to follow His leadings and there is no man so depraved that he does not sometimes follow this Voice. Conversion in the Quaker sense occurs when man turns, sometimes suddenly but more often gradually, from partial obedience to complete obedience to the Divine Leading. Such an absolute surrender, our journalists find, is very difficult to make for it implies the paradoxical requirement that the self shall will to become selfless. Reason may bring convincement but it cannot unify the life. It is always possible for reason to discover contrary reasons. Stephen Crisp (1628–1692) writes:

Here at the very first of my convincement did the enemy of my soul make trial to slay me and that after this manner

⁸⁰ *Memoirs*, p. viii.

⁸¹ *Memoirs*, p. 157.

that, seeing my wisdom and reason were overcome by the truth, I could not therewith withstand it, therefore I received the truth and held it in the same part with which I withstood it, and defended it with the same reason by which I resisted it, and so was yet a stranger to the cross that was to crucify me.⁸²

Full surrender, in which the human will is wholly centered in the Divine Will, as a small wheel is made to revolve on the same axis as a large wheel, marks the end of inner conflict and produces unification of life through a single purpose. If conflicts again arise it is probably because surrender is not complete. "I kept no part back. After this full surrender of all things into his holy hands he was pleased to remove my troubles,"⁸³ writes William Williams (1763-1824). "This," writes James Gough (1712-1780) "was the day of my soul's espousal to Jesus Christ. I was ready and willing to do anything that I saw I ought to do."⁸⁴

There is great variation in the external conditions which accompany this experience. William Savery (1750-1804) passed through his most important change while sitting alone; J. J. Neave (1836-1903) while reading to a dying man; Edward Stabler (1769-1831) by a vision; Edward Hicks through a "peculiar solemnity and silence in the countenance of a woman minister;⁸⁵ Oliver Sansom (1636-1710) by observing the sufferings of persecuted Friends; Richard H. Thomas (1854-1904) by a Haverford College prayer meeting; while the majority arrived at the crowning experience in a meeting for worship.

Yet our journalists do not always discover an event in their lives which is preeminent over all others in effecting

⁸² *F.L.* XIV, 142.

⁸³ *Journal*, p. 13.

⁸⁴ *F.L.* IX, 9.

⁸⁵ *Journal*, p. 52.

a change. In a majority of instances the transformation was gradual. "As I lived under the cross and simply followed the openings of truth my mind from day to day was more enlightened,"⁸⁶ writes John Woolman (1720-1772).

Thomas Kite (1785-1845) writes of his wife, "After a time of serious attention to the gradual unfoldings of Heavenly light she was joined in membership with us."⁸⁷ Mary Capper (1755-1845) says, "It was not suddenly that I made any outward change . . . a door (was opened) which step by step I entered."⁸⁸ William Forster's (1784-1853) biographer says of him:

Unaccompanied by any marked crisis in his conscious experience, the transition from a state of unregenerate nature to one of real conversion to God appears in his case to have been of a very gentle and almost imperceptible character.⁸⁹

The most important fact which stands out in these Quaker journals is that the complete change from a self-centered to a God-centered life is usually marked by some visible act. A self-surrender which was wholly inward did not, as a rule, eliminate the sense of uneasiness. There must be an outer as well as an inner adjustment. The world must know that a decision had been made and to accomplish this a public stand must be taken. The two actions which finally brought a sense of accomplishment to the journalists and with it a feeling of complete peace, were the entrance on the vocal ministry and, in the 18th and 19th centuries, the adoption of "plain dress" and other outer manifestations of the inward state.

6. *Entrance on the Ministry* marked the most important turning point in the lives of a majority of these writers

⁸⁶ *F.L.* IV, 326.

⁸⁷ *Memoirs and Letters*, 1883.

⁸⁸ *F.L.* XII, 54.

⁸⁹ *Memoirs*, p. 5.

because the vocal ministry was an "awful and solemn service" which required great clearness that a true leading was followed, and a corresponding complete surrender of one's "own will" to a difficult and delicate requirement. This surrender was the most important event in the conversion process. In the early days of the Society the intense enthusiasm generated by an exciting new discovery in religion led many into the ministry as soon as they joined the movement, but, sometimes in the early days, and as a rule in the later days the ministry was entered only after a long struggle against the call to it. Charles Marshall (1637-1698) one of the most fearless of the early Friends' writes:

So hard was it for me to open my mouth in those meetings at Bristol that had not the Lord caused his power to be manifest in my heart as new wine in a vessel that wanted vent, I might have perished.⁴⁰

"My natural disposition," writes Thomas Arnett, (1791-1887) "had a great aversion to becoming a mouth for the Almighty."⁴¹

John Yeardley (1786-1858) thus records his resistance: "Went to meeting this morning with a painful apprehension lest I should have to expose myself in that which is so contrary to my natural inclination."⁴² After eleven years of struggle he writes:

I felt myself in such a resigned state of mind in our little week-day meeting that I could not doubt the time was fully come for me to be relieved from that state of unspeakable oppression which my poor mind had been held in for so many years past.

⁴⁰ *F.L.* IV, 130.

⁴¹ *Journal*, (1884), p. 20.

⁴² *Diary* (1859), p. 28.

John Churchman (1705-1777) after eight years of hesitation, "had a few words fresh before me with a gentle motion to deliver them which I feared to omit."⁴³ Martha Routh (1743-1817) felt called to the ministry at fourteen but after a long conflict which nearly resulted in her death and during which her large school diminished to three pupils her "bonds were broken" at the age of twenty-nine. "After resignation took place," she writes, "I hardly knew how I was raised from my seat to [express a brief message]." ⁴⁴

John Comly (1773-1850) felt at fifteen that he would become a minister, but he did not preach until he was twenty-nine. Mary Alexander (1760-1810) received her first intimation at seventeen. At twenty-nine, "A light shone round my bed and I heard a voice intelligibly say 'Thou art appointed to preach the gospel.'" ⁴⁵ This ended her conflict. John J. Cornell (1826-1909) at nineteen heard a voice which said, "I shall call thee into the work of the ministry," ⁴⁶ but he did not preach until he was thirty. Joseph Hoag (1762-1853) received the call at the age of twelve and spoke at twenty, after "the Lord said to my spiritual ear, 'Take thy choice decidedly for thou shalt have no longer time to be waited upon.'" ⁴⁷

Some Friends became ministers while acting as travelling companions to ministers. Christine Majolier Alsop (1805-1879) found it an easy transition from interpreting for Friends to interpreting for the Lord. Few like Allen Jay (1831-1910) were made hesitant by an impediment in speech, though John Richardson (1666-1753) was cured of stammering. James Gough (1712-1780) was so em-

⁴³ *F.L.* VI, 185.

⁴⁴ *F.L.* XII, 418.

⁴⁵ *Journal*, (1811), p. 24.

⁴⁶ *Autobiography*, (1906), p. 23.

⁴⁷ *Journal* (1860), p. 45.

barrassed when he first spoke that he held his hat before his eyes, but he writes that after he sat down, "a flood of divine joy poured into my heart."⁴⁸

That entrance on the ministry brought an extraordinary sense of peace, is the testimony of all the journalists except a very few who, like John Woolman, began by "outrunning the guide." "This first public espousal of the Redeemer's cause brought a flood of peace and joy over my spirit that seemed almost overpowering,"⁴⁹ writes Benjamin Seeböhm (1798-1871).

That the beginning of the vocal ministry was always a critical turning point is shown by the fact that the journalists, even though they are writing many years afterward, can record the text they used in their first utterance in meeting and often the exact words of their first sermon, which was always very short. Yielding to this requirement was the central event in the conversion process because it was a public declaration that the speaker had surrendered to being an instrument of the Lord. Samuel Bownas (1676-1753) writes that this "broke the ice." David Ferris (1707-1779) after twenty-three years of hesitating to speak could say, "At that time I was made a real Quaker."⁵⁰ Thomas Kite told William Evans (1787-1867) after his first sermon that "a child was born." Not only did ministry mark a real turning point in the inner life, but it signified an extraordinary expansion of group consciousness; for the minister is no longer a private individual but a "public Friend" speaking for God and the group of which he is a part. After his first sermon John Barclay writes, "next to the answer of peace from God in my own bosom what I have desired has often been the unity of the

⁴⁸ *F.L.* IX, 13.

⁴⁹ *Private Memoirs* p. 106.

⁵⁰ *Memoirs*, 1855, p. 68.

church and the love of the brethren,"⁵¹ and this he had obtained by his speaking.

The average age of entrance on the ministry of the one hundred journalists here considered was twenty-six.

7. *The adoption of plain dress*, accompanied by "plain speech" and simplicity of living if these had not already been practiced, was an important stage in the spiritual development of the journalist, but its significance is not easily understood today. The dress testimony was distinctly an eighteenth and nineteenth century phenomenon, though in the seventeenth century the use of "thee and thou," keeping on the hat and refusing to bow to superiors accomplished nearly the same purpose. "It has" writes John Comly who chose it as a child, "been many times since a blessing to me as a monitor to remind me of a plainness of conduct corresponding with the cut of my coat."⁵²

For some to whom it was a real sacrifice it marked the chief turning point in the conversion process. Joseph John Gurney (1788-1847) records how he lost his high social standing by entering a drawing room with his hat on. He says, "I dare not neglect a circumstance which was, under the divine blessing, made the means of fully deciding my course."⁵³

Thomas Ellwood (1639-1713) marked the same definite determination by keeping on his hat in front of his father.⁵⁴ John G. Sargent (1813-1883) made his important decision while living in Paris and deciding to say "thee and thou" in French.⁵⁵ Many journalists would agree with Thomas Shillitoe when he said that he "had a great fondness for

⁵¹ *F.L.* VI, 438.

⁵² *Journal*, p. 20.

⁵³ *Memoirs*, p. 39.

⁵⁴ *F.L.* VII, 359.

⁵⁵ *Diary*, 1885.

gay apparel and felt his peace was concerned in mortifying this disposition." ⁵⁶

Plainness was sometimes a means of self-discipline by which a person's "own will" was controlled. When Elizabeth Ashbridge said to little Sarah Stephenson (1738-1802), "what a pity that a child should have a ribbon on her head," the child could not sleep that night and came down in the morning without the ribbon. "This," she writes, "was coming a little to the gate of stripping, which work went gradually forward." ⁵⁷

By such "stripping" we are, of course, to understand the removal of any obstacle to the soul's progress, and the chief of these obstacles was pride. Granted that pride in plainness was often only too apparent and that this plainness was frequently of a purely formal sort, an examination of these journals clearly shows that "going plain" marked a real and sometimes supremely important milestone in the Pilgrim's Progress of the Quaker. There were few who made such serious sacrifices in behalf of plainness of dress as did the Quaker tailors. Gilbert Latey (1626-1708) and John Hall (1637-1719) lost most of their business by refusing to make fashionable clothes.

8. *Periods of Depression* are recorded in nearly all the journals of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but less often in those of the seventeenth because persecution was always a stimulant, never a depressant. These periods of depression are not to be confused with the periods of conflict. The journalist may have solved his inner tension by a complete surrender to the will of God, but the Divine Presence seems sometimes to be withdrawn for no apparent reason, unless it be for a test of faithfulness. "Early this spring (1737)," writes John Churchman

⁵⁶ *F.L.* III, 75.

⁵⁷ *Memoirs*, 1807, p. 4.

(1705-1777), "the Lord was pleased to try me with poverty and inward want which brought me into great searching of heart, and inquiry into the cause, but [I] could not understand that I had willfully disobeyed, neither stood convicted in my mind for doing amiss."⁵⁸ After much suffering he concluded that God was "pleased to let me know experimentally the value of heavenly bread by the want of it." This trial lasted all summer and was only gradually removed. Elizabeth Collins (1775-1831) writes that "it is often my lot to pass through gloomy winter seasons."⁵⁹ "Poor and almost insensible of good"⁶⁰ records Henry Hull (1765-1834) more than once in his diary. Such periods of depression prevented appearance in the ministry. "There seemed to come over me a cloud of thick darkness, so that my mouth was stopt for a time,"⁶¹ wrote John Croker (1672-1727). Not infrequently the sense of God's presence left the minister when a crowd had gathered to hear him preach. "The way appeared closed up as to any public communication amongst this people whom I had taken so much pains to come and see,"⁶² writes Thomas Scattergood. "Was at meeting in suffering silence"⁶³ records Job Scott from time to time in his journal. These times of depression are not always evidences of backward steps in spiritual progress nor are they always signs of a peculiar psychic temperament possessed by Friends' ministers. The sense of the Divine Presence was a high and holy experience. It could not be continuous. There must be valleys if there were to be mountains.

9. *Curtailment of Business* in order that it might not interfere with spiritual progress and the work of the min-

⁵⁸ F.L. VI, 188.

⁵⁹ F.L. XI, 462.

⁶⁰ F.L. IV, 247.

⁶¹ F.L. XIV, 9.

⁶² F.L. VIII, 15.

⁶³ *Journal*, p. 338.

istry was not unusual amongst Friends who were successful enough to make curtailment a definite renunciation. In the age of persecution this problem did not exist, for Friends lost most of their property through refusal to pay fines or tithes. In later times extensive travelling in the ministry brought with it financial sacrifice, even when the minister, though never professional, received support during his travels, for it meant the neglect of business or farm or school. But in many cases the motive for financial sacrifice was that expressed by William Penn,—“he that loses by getting had better lose than gain,” and quoted by John Barclay on being initiated into his father’s bank.⁶⁴

The best known case is that of John Woolman who grew uneasy “about my business growing too cumbersome,”⁶⁵ and decided to decrease it. Daniel Wheeler, after striking adventures as a soldier and sailor, became a Friend and a prosperous seed merchant and found the two careers were incompatible:

As I have from time to time endeavoured to dwell near and abide in and under the calming influence of His power, I have been led to believe that something sooner or later would be required as a sacrifice on my part. . . . I therefore fully believe that it will be most conducive to my present peace, as well as future well being, entirely to give up the trade I am at present engaged in, and retire with my family into a small compass.⁶⁶

William Evans (1787–1867), when offered a partnership in a large dry goods business, refused it:

My present business, being small and one that I understood, was managed with ease. It required little capital and involved me in no engagements that I did not hold the means to

⁶⁴ *F.L.* VI, 387.

⁶⁵ *F.L.* IV, 341.

⁶⁶ *Memoirs of Daniel Wheeler*, p. 45.

meet; so that I was free from anxiety on that account, and at liberty to attend, unincumbered, appointments of the Society or any impression of duty to go to a meeting that I might have. . . . It seemed that if I pursued the prospect of adopting the proposed change of business, that I should be lost to religious society and to the works of religion in my own heart. . . . I looked forward with renewed peace and satisfaction at the path and the business before me, though small, remembering that the earth is the Lord's and the cattle on a thousand hills.⁶⁷

William Edmundson (1627-1712) writes:

Business in the affairs of the world became a burden to me, though there were presentations and opportunities to get riches either by trading, taking land by lease, mortgage or purchase, which I was able to do.⁶⁸

Thomas Shillitoe (1756-1836) speaks of an

apprehension which at times presented to my mind that the time was fast approaching when I must be willing to relinquish a good business and set myself more at liberty to attend to my religious duties from home. The language which my Divine Master renewedly proclaimed in the ear of my soul, was "Gather up thy wares into thy house for I have need of the residue of thy days."⁶⁹

Thomas Shillitoe had five children to settle in life, but he left that "to the same Almighty Power who had so abundantly cared for us." Nevertheless he writes, "the prospect of relinquishing a good business was at times a close trial to my soul."

John Fothergill (1676-1744) at twenty-two years of age "believed it right to dispose of his business and to let his land that he might be more at liberty."⁷⁰

⁶⁷ *Journal*, pp. 30-31.

⁶⁸ *F.L.* II, 98.

⁶⁹ *F.L.* III, 93.

⁷⁰ *Memoirs*, p. 4.

Martha Routh whose school was too large for its quarters describes how she went out to look at a larger house:

As I passed from room to room I was attended by a secret but clear intimation that I was not to entangle myself with a greater number of scholars than the house we already had would accommodate, so I entirely gave up the thought and found peace.⁷¹

These examples of restraint are of particular interest because of a frequent assertion that Friends became so successful in business that they lost their primitive simplicity and spirituality. Max Weber, in *The Protestant Ethic*, makes the Quakers share with the Puritans the responsibility for modern capitalism because of a religion which not only taught diligence in business as a divine "calling," but also an asceticism and simplicity which did not permit the accumulated wealth to be spent. Though in some cases this applies to the Quakers, there are many cases which follow the course here sketched as typical of Quaker ministers. Of the leading ministers whom we are here considering, each made some serious sacrifice in order to carry on the work of the ministry, and some deliberately restricted their business lest it occupy the mind too exclusively. By the Quakers, diligence in business was not despised, but there was a stage in spiritual development when it was expected that something higher should take precedence over it. We may here compare the four stages in the spiritual development of the Brahman as described in the laws of Manu according to which he is first a student, then a householder, later he surrenders his home and business and becomes a hermit, finally he becomes a lonely ascetic practicing severe austerities.

In our examination of these journals we have reviewed a pattern of life developed by leaders of the Society of

⁷¹ *F.L.* XII, p. 419.

Friends in the first two centuries of its history. This pattern was also valid in the experience of many of the rank and file. Though the Quaker journalists portray, in its essential form, the drama of the universal human soul, there are certain facts which stand out as characteristic of them as a group. Their drama ends successfully. There is no final tragedy nor defeat. Its climax is the attainment of peace and singleness of purpose. Opening on scenes of childish innocence and artless communion with the Father, passing on through an exuberant display of animal spirits half restrained by an incipient awareness of guilt, it portrays, as self-consciousness increases, man entering upon a period of struggle with his enemy. This enemy is found to be "self." Self-centeredness is at war with another inward centre which is divine. "Self" is overcome and unity is attained, not, as in certain types of mysticism, by letting self melt into God as a drop of water merges into the ocean, but by setting the human will in line with the Divine will and then letting God act through it in His work of creating a better world. In such creative activity rather than in passive contemplation man realises his essential unity with God. "The Society of Friends," says Evelyn Underhill, "has produced no great contemplative."⁷² If this is true, it is because the Quakers, like others of the Anglo-Saxon race, thought primarily in terms of action. For our journalists action meant, first of all, the difficult and sacrificial work of the vocal ministry through which they endeavored, not to preach some theory of a new social order, but to build up a real, if small, human society, divinely inspired, a germ cell of a greater divine-human society.

⁷² Evelyn Underhill, *Worship*, p. 313.

BOOKS BY RUFUS M. JONES

- 1889. Eli and Sybil Jones: Their Life and Work. Porter & Coates, Phila.
- 1899. Practical Christianity. J. C. Winston Co., Phila.
- 1905. Practical Christianity. New and enlarged Edition.
- 1901. A Dynamic Faith. 4 Editions. Headley Bros., London.
- 1902. A Boy's Religion from Memory. Ferris & Leach, Phila.
- 1903. A Boy's Religion from Memory. Headley Bros., London.
- 1913. A Boy's Religion from Memory. Ferris & Leach, Phila.
- 1903. George Fox: An Autobiography. 2 Vols. Illus. Ferris & Leach, Phila.
- 1906. George Fox: An Autobiography. Ferris & Leach, Phila.
- 1904. George Fox. An Autobiography. 1 Vol. Ferris & Leach, Phila.
- 1919. George Fox: An Autobiography. 1 Vol. Ferris & Leach, Phila.
- 1912. George Fox: An Autobiography. Headley Bros., London.
- 1919. George Fox: An Autobiography. Pennsbury Series, Friends Book Store, Phila.
- 1904. Social Law in the Spiritual World. J. C. Winston Co., Phila.
- Social Law in the Spiritual World. Headley Bros., London.
- 1923. Social Law in the Spiritual World. The Swarthmore Press, London.
- 1905. The Double Search. J. C. Winston Co., Phila.
- 1906. The Double Search. Headley Bros., London.
- 1937. The Double Search. J. C. Winston Co., Phila.
- Das Zwiefache Suchen. Berlin.
- 1906. Quakerism and the Simple Life. Headley Bros., London.
- 1908. The Abundant Life. Headley Bros., London.

1908. Quakerism: A Religion of Life. Headley Bros., London.
1912. Quakerism: A Religion of Life. Headley Bros., London.
1921. Die Lehre der Quäker (Trans. of above). Mohrenstrasse 33, Berlin W. 8.
1909. Little Book of Selections from the Children of the Light. Headley Bros., London.
1909. Studies in Mystical Religion. 3 Editions. Macmillan & Co., London.
1936. Studies in Mystical Religion. 4th Edition. Macmillan & Co., London.
1910. Selections from the Writings of Clement of Alexandria. Headley Bros., London.
1911. The Quakers in the American Colonies. Macmillan & Co., London. (With I. Sharpless and A. M. Gummere.)
1923. The Quakers in the American Colonies. 2nd Edition. Macmillan & Co., London.
1911. Stories of Hebrew Heroes. Headley Bros., London.
1928. Stories of Hebrew Heroes. Geo. Allen & Unwin, London.
1920. Stories of Hebrew Heroes. In Chinese. Christian Lit. Soc., Shanghai.
1924. Stories of Hebrew Heroes. In Chinese. 2d Edition. Christian Lit. Soc., Shanghai.
1914. Spiritual Reformers in 16th and 17th Centuries. Macmillan & Co., London. 2 Editions.
1925. Geistige Reformatoren (Trans. of above). Quäker-verlag, Berlin.
1916. The Inner Life. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.
1923. The Inner Life. 2nd Edition. Macmillan & Co., London.
1917. St. Paul the Hero. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.
1926. St. Paul the Hero. 2d Edition. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.
1924. San Pablo el Heroe. The Macmillan Co., Mexico.
1918. The World Within. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.
1921. The World Within. 2d Edition. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.

1930. *The World Within*. Reissue. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.
1919. *The Story of George Fox*. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.
1922. *The Story of George Fox*. 1st Ed. London, 2d N. Y. The Macmillan Co., N. Y. and London.
1925. *The Story of George Fox*. In Swedish. J. A. Lindblads Forlag, Upsala.
1920. *The Remnant*. Swarthmore Press, London.
1920. *The Nature & Authority of Conscience*. Swarthmore Press, London.
1920. *A Service of Love in War Time*. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.
1921. *Later Periods of Quakerism*. 2 Vols. Macmillan & Co., London.
1922. *The Boy Jesus and His Companions*. 2 Editions. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.
1930. *The Boy Jesus and His Companions*. Illus. by Katman Kubinyi. Little Library Ed.
1922. *Spiritual Energies in Daily Life*. 4 Editions. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.
1923. *Religious Foundations*, edited, 4 printings. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.
1924. *Fundamental Ends of Life*. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.
1925. *Fundamental Ends of Life*. 2d Edition. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.
1930. *Fundamental Ends of Life*. Macmillan & Co., London.
1924. *The Life and Message of George Fox*. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.
1926. *The Life and Message of George Fox*. Japanese. Christian Lit. Soc., Tokyo.
1925. *The Church's Debt to Heretics*. James Clark & Co., London.
1926. *Finding the Trail of Life*. The Macmillan Co., N. Y., and Geo. Allen & Unwin, London.
1927. *Finding the Trail of Life*. 3d printing. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.
1927. *The Faith and Practice of the Quakers*. Methuen & Co., London.
1928. *The Faith and Practice of the Quakers*. Doubleday Doran.

1927. *New Studies in Mystical Religion*. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.
1928. *New Studies in Mystical Religion*. 3d printing. (Jan., March, August.) The Macmillan Co., N. Y. and London.
1928. *The New Quest*. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.
1929. *The New Quest*. Reprinted, Jan. and July. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.
1928. George Fox. Christian Lit. Soc., Madras, India.
1929. *Vom Sinn und Endzweck des Lebens*. Quaker-Verlag, Leipzig.
1929. *The Trail of Life in College*. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.
1930. *Some Exponents of Mystical Religion*. The Abingdon Press, N. Y.
1930. George Fox, Seeker and Friend. (Creative Lives.) Harper & Bros., N. Y.
1930. George Fox, Seeker and Friend. Geo. Allen & Unwin, London.
1931. *Pathways to the Reality of God*. The Macmillan Co., N. Y., September.
1931. *Pathways to the Reality of God*. Reprinted. The Macmillan Co., N. Y., November.
1931. *Quakergeloof en Quakerleven*. N. V. Servire, Dan Haag, November.
1932. *Mysticism and Democracy in the English Commonwealth*. Harvard University Press.
1932. *A Preface to Christian Faith in a New Age*. The Macmillan Co., N. Y., April.
1931. *Hebreeuwsche Helden*, tr. by I. C. Thomson-Wentholt. Van Gorcum & Comp., N. V., Uitgevers.
1931. *Het Heldenleven van Paulus*. Van Gorcum & Comp., N. V., Uitgevers.
1933. *Jezus en zijn Vrienden*. Van Gorcum & Comp., N. V., Uitgevers.
1933. *Haverford College, A History and an Interpretation*. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.
1935. *Rethinking Religious Liberalism*. Beacon Press, Boston.
1934. *Trail of Life in Middle Years*. The Macmillan Co., N. Y., March.
1936. *The Testimony of the Soul*. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.

1936. *Pathways to the Reality of God in Braille.* 2 Vols.
American Brotherhood for Blind, Los Angeles.
1937. *Some Problems of Life.* Cokesbury Press, Nashville,
Tenn.

ARTICLES BY RUFUS M. JONES

1883. *Progression* (First Article in Print) *The Haverfordian*,
Feb. Vol. IV. 5
1885. *Mysticism* (not printed) Commencement Address
1884. Editor in Chief of *Haverfordian*, May to April, 1885 inc.
1893-1894 Editor of *The Friends Review*
1894-1912 Editor of *The American Friend*
1913-1915 Editor *Present Day Papers*
1900 to date Contributor to *The Friend* (London)
1909 to date Contributor to *Friends Quarterly Examiner*
(London)
1912-1922 Articles in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*
1917-1920 Monthly Article in *Homiletic Review*
1912 to date Articles in *Friends Intelligencer*, *American*
Friend and *Philadelphia Friend*
1907 to date Forewords to 23 Books
1910 to date Single Chapters in 24 other books
1928-1936 11 Articles in *Dictionary of American Biography*
133 Book Reviews and Articles in other Magazines

INDEX

Abolition, 325, 349-351; Bill, 350.
 Alexander, Mary, 398.
 Allen, William, 183, 198, 202, 236, 359, 360.
 Alsop, Christine Majolier, 183, 398.
 American Friends Service Committee, 377.
 American Revolution, 36, 214, 233, 243, 248, 275.
 Ames, William, 153, 160, 198-199, 205-206.
 Amyraut, Moses, 6-18.
 Anthony, David, 356.
 Anti-slavery, 315-316, 322-325.
 Arnett, Thomas, 389, 397.
 Ashbridge, Elizabeth, 401.

 Backhouse, Hannah Chapman, 184.
 Banks, John, 392.
 Barclay, John, 388, 403.
 Barclay, Robert, 6, 136-137, 159, 167, 168-170, 173, 177, 195, 285, 393.
 Bartram, John, 184.
 Beals, Thomas, 307-308, 330.
 Bellers, John, 359-360.
 Berkeley of Stratton, John, Baron, 92, 128.
 Besse, Joseph, 115, 176.
 Billing, Philadelphia, 90-91, 95.
 Billing, see Byllynge.
 Boehme, Jacob, 142.
 Bownas, Samuel, 399.
 Brailsford, Mabel R., 67.
 Braithwaite, Joseph Bevan, 184.
 Braithwaite, William Charles, 62, 145, 194.
 Brayshaw, A. N., 146.
 Bright, John, 359.
 Brown, Moses, 248, 257.
 Buffum, Arnold, 315, 324.

Burnyeat, John, 138.
 Burrrough, Edward, 119, 124, 149, 173.
 Buxton, Sir Thomas Fowell, 333-353.
 Byllynge, Edward, 85-132.

 Cannon, Joseph Gurney, 316, 328.
 Capper, Mary, 396.
 Carleton, Deborah, 291.
 Carolina Charter, 34-36, 44.
 Caton, William, 152-154, 160, 163, 183, 198-201, 205-206, 386.
 Chalkley, Thos., 201.
Christian Quaker, The, 1-23.
 Churchman, John, 398, 401.
 Clarkson, Thomas, 64, 293, 300, 353.
 Claus, Jacob, 169, 204.
 Claus, Jan, 143, 156, 204.
 Coale, Josiah, 38.
 Coffin, Charles F., 368.
 Coffin, Levi, 315.
 Collins, Elizabeth, 402.
 Comly, John, 398.
 Comstock, Elizabeth, 329, 359.
 Congress, U. S., 227-229, 235, 237.
 Conscientious objectors, 246.
 Constitution, U. S., 44, 48, 52.
 Conversion, 394-396.
 Convincement, 391-394.
 Conway, Lady Anne, Viscountess, 137, 141.
 Cornell, John J., 398.
 Cornwall, 88-108.
 Cresson, Warder, 163.
 Crisp, Stephen, 145, 205, 389, 394.
 Croese, Gerard, 137, 140, 178, 181.
 Croker, John, 402.
 Crouch, William, 392.

 Davies, Richard, 148.
 Dickinson, James, 387.

- Discipline, The, 281-282, 287.
 Draft Military, 266, 267, 270, 271, 272.
- Earlham, 334, 336.
 Edmundson, William, 138, 392, 404.
 Ellwood, Thomas, 111, 400.
 Elys, Dr. Edmund, 168-169.
 Evans, Thomas and William, 192, 193, 390, 399, 403.
- Fell, Margaret, 136, 140, 149, 151, 158, 160, 163, 176, 279, 341.
 Fenwick, John, 88, 128, 129.
 Ferris, David, 185, 387, 399.
 Fisher, Samuel, 135, 136, 152, 155, 161-162, 173.
 Forster, William, 396.
 Fothergill, Dr. John, 151, 179.
 Fox, George, 6, 38, 56, 87-90, 97, 101, 104, 107, 116, 118, 119, 123, 125, 129, 130, 138, 139, 145-148, 153-154, 159, 167-168, 170, 171, 172, 173, 178, 187, 192, 196, 205, 279, 341, 359, 383.
 Fox the Younger, George, 111-115.
Frame of Government, 35, 38-39, 42-43, 47, 124.
 Franklin, Benjamin, 49, 52.
 Fry, Elizabeth, 336, 341, 345, 352, 359-360.
 Fry, Joseph, 336, 341.
 Furlly, Benjamin, 38, 137, 146, 151, 155, 177, 180, 205.
- Garrison, William Lloyd, 324.
 Gentile Divinity, 9-12, 15, 17, 21-23.
 Germany, 28, 46, 56, 57.
 Gough, James, 395, 398.
 Graham, John William, 4, 9, 15, 68, 83.
 Greek, 139, 142, 149, 180, 335.
 Grellet, Stephen, 202, 393.
 Griffith, John, 385.
 Gummere, Amelia Mott, 83.
 Gurney, Hannah, 336-338, 342.
 Gurney, Joseph John, 184, 339, 400.
- Haggar, Mary, 386.
 Hall, John, 393, 401.
 Hambly, Loveday, 88-90, 95, 106, 107, 126.
 Harlan, George, 309.
 Harris, J. Rendel, 13.
 Harvey, Isaac and Sarah, 328.
 Haydock, Roger, 201.
 Hebrew, 135-164, 180.
 Heston, Zebulon, 307.
 Hewes, Joseph, 211-240.
 Hicks, Edward, 387, 395.
 Hoag, Joseph, 398.
 Hoare, Samuel, 334, 352.
 Hobbes, Thomas, 31-34, 40-41.
 Hobbs, Barnabas C., 316.
 Hodgkin, Thomas, 91.
 Holland, 191-209.
 Holme, Benjamin, 174, 201.
 Holy Experiment, 40, 46.
 Hookes, Ellis, 127, 140, 159, 163.
 Howgill, Francis, 118.
 Hubberthorne, Richard, 125.
 Hull, Henry, 402.
 Hull, William I., 6, 137, 140, 160, 178.
 Hunt, Levi, 266.
 Hunt, Sarah, 388.
 Huntley, Thomas, 181.
- Indians, 49, 50, 57, 216-217, 220, 243, 316-320, 379.
 Ireland, 279-303.
 Israel, Manasseh ben, 156-157, 163.
- Janney, Samuel M., 64-65, 83, 185, 387.
 Jay, Allen, 398.
 Jews, 138-164.
 Jones, Rebecca, 390.
 Jones, Rufus M., 90, 194, 197, 282, 357.
- Keith, George, 13, 21, 136-137, 141, 150, 157, 172, 178-179, 393.
 Kite, Thomas, 396, 399.
 Kretschmer, E., 58-59, 66-68, 79, 83.
- Lancaster, Joseph, 291, 365.
 Latey, Gilbert, 401.

- Latin, 137, 140, 141, 142, 149, 152, 167-187, 335.
 Lawson, Thomas, 136-137, 160-161, 177.
 Leadbeater, Mary, 285, 287, 290.
 Lindley, Jacob, 317.
 Locke, John, 33-52.
 Logan, James, 35, 180.
 London Yearly Meeting, 75, 244, 254, 288.
 Lundy, Benjamin, 314, 322, 324.
 Marshall, Charles, 397.
 Maryland, 35, 309.
 Massachusetts, 52, 217, 235, 245, 258, 264, 273, 274.
 Massey, William, 174, 175.
 Mead, William, 35, 119, 125.
 Mennonites, 189-209.
 Michigan, 326, 329.
 Military exemption, 248, 251, duty, 252, 316, service, 253, 263-264.
 Militia, 247, 250, 269-274, 376.
 Mollineux, Mary, 175.
 Mott, Lucretia, 359.
 Myers, Albert Cook, 89, 97, 129.
 Nayler, James, 116, 186.
 Neave, J. J., 395.
 Negroes, 57, 73, 213, 379.
 New Hampshire, 274.
 New Jersey, 28, 52, 56, 107, 123, 124, 129, 214, 217, 322, 329, West New Jersey, 43, 56, 123, 128, 129.
 New York, 50, 52.
 Nicholson, Timothy, 355-381.
 Ogden, Joseph, 220.
 Ohio, 308, 312, 315, 321, 325, 326, 329.
 Osborn, Charles, 322, 323.
 Parker, Alexander, 108, 118-119, 126.
 Parrish, John, 307.
 Pastorius, Francis Daniel, 142.
 Pemberton, John, 204.
 Penal code, 340, 345; institutions, 360, 368; system, 368.
 Penington, Isaac, 150, 154.
 Penington, Mary, 280.
 Penn, William, 1-68, 89, 90, 108, 129, 136, 155, 158-167, 177, 178, 182, 201, 202, 217, 338, 342, 403.
 Penney, Norman, 88, 92, 97, 102.
 Pennsylvania, 28, 31, 35, 37, 45-52, 56, 65, 124, 140, 145, 217, 309, 311.
 Pepys, Samuel, 87, 88, 94, 104, 129.
 Perrot, John, 155.
 Philadelphia, 91, 108, 111, 157, 220, 221.
 Philips, Catherine, 391.
 Plainness, 78; plain dress, 386, 401.
 Prache, Hilary, 142-144.
 Prisons, 329, 340, 344, 365, 368, 386.
 Prohibition, 360, 374.
 Purver, Anthony, 151.
 Reckitt, William, 183.
 Rhode Island, 244, 246, 253, 255, 274, 275.
 Richardson, George, 389.
 Richardson, John, 179, 398.
 Richardson, Richard, 137.
 Roberts, Gerard, 158.
 Routh, Martha, 385, 398, 405.
 Rowntree, J. W., 151.
 Sansom, Oliver, 395.
 Sargeant, John G., 400.
 Savery, William, 289, 395.
 Scattergood, Thomas, 387, 402.
 Schwenkfeld, Caspar, 196.
 Scott, Job, 390, 402.
 Seebohm, Benjamin, 399.
 Seewel, Jacob Willemszoon, 198.
 Sewell, Willem, 169, 173-174, 177-178, 204, 206.
 Shackleton, Abraham, 289.
 Shackleton, Richard, 283, 297.
 Sharpless, Isaac, 201.
 Shillitoe, Thomas, 400, 404.
 Sidney, Algernon, 42-43.
 Simplicity, 78, 82, 281, 400, simple living, 386.
 Slavery, 56, 73, 309, 321-325, 349-351, 353.
 Slaves, 72, 213, 325, 338, 345, 349-351, 365-366.

- Slave trade, 348, 353; traffic, 57.
 Smith, Joseph, 4, 119, 120, 151, 158,
 168, 178, 179.
 Stabler, Edward, 395.
 Stanton, Edwin, M., 327.
 Stockton, Richard, 214.
 Story, Thomas, 186, 203, 387.
 Stubbs, John, 137, 138, 146, 149,
 151, 152, 161, 162, 173, 176, 180.
 Sturge, Joseph, 359.
 Suttee, 338, 340.

 Tallack, William, 192, 193.
 Tatum, David, 329.
 Taylor, Christopher, 145, 181.
 Taylor, George, 136.
 Taylor, Hannah, 388.
 Temperance, 360, 373, 386.
 Thomas, Allen C., 154.
 Thomas, Richard H., 395.
 Tomlinson, William, 158.
 Tuke, Esther, 76, the Tukes, 359,
 360.
 Turner, Thomas, 136.

 Underground railroad, 322.

 van Belmont, Francis Mercurius,
 137, 141.
 Virginia, 52, 308, 311, 321, 322.
 Vulliamy, C. E., 6, 16.

 Wheeler, Daniel, 393, 394, 403.
 West New Jersey, 43, 56, 123, 128,
 129.
 Whitehead, George, 4, 5, 146-147,
 159, 392.
 Whitehead, John, 390.
 Whiting, John, 139, 158.
 Whittier, John Greenleaf, 77, 302.
 Wilberforce, William, 340, 345-348,
 351.
 Williams, Roger, 138-139, 149, 150.
 William, Williams, 395.
 Woolman, John, 56-58, 68-83, 301-
 302, 359-360, 383, 396, 399, 403.

 Yeardley, John, 397.

 Zinspenning, Judith, 198, 204-205.

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



133 172

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

